arXiv:1703.06810v1 [math.ST] 20 Mar 2017

The geometry of hypothesis testing over convex cones: Generalized likelihood tests and minimax radii

Yuting Wei[†] Martin J. Wainwright[†,⋆] Adityanand Guntuboyina[†]

March 21, 2017

Department of Statistics[†], and
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences[⋆]
UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720

Abstract

We consider a compound testing problem within the Gaussian sequence model in which the null and alternative are specified by a pair of closed, convex cones. Such cone testing problem arise in various applications, including detection of treatment effects, trend detection in econometrics, signal detection in radar processing, and shape-constrained inference in non-parametric statistics. We provide a sharp characterization of the GLRT testing radius up to a universal multiplicative constant in terms of the geometric structure of the underlying convex cones. When applied to concrete examples, this result reveals some interesting phenomena that do not arise in the analogous problems of estimation under convex constraints. In particular, in contrast to estimation error, the testing error no longer depends purely on the problem complexity via a volume-based measure (such as metric entropy or Gaussian complexity); other geometric properties of the cones also play an important role. To address the issue of optimality, we prove information-theoretic lower bounds for minimax testing radius again in terms of geometric quantities. Our general theorems are illustrated by examples including the cases of monotone and orthant cones, and involve some results of independent interest.

1 Introduction

Composite testing problems arise in a wide variety of applications and the generalized likelihood ratio test (GLRT) is a general purpose approach to such problems. The basic idea of the likelihood ratio test dates back to the early works of Fisher, Neyman and Pearson; it attracted further attention following the work of Edwards [15], who emphasized likelihood as a general principle of inference. Recent years have witnessed a great amount of work on the GLRT in various contexts, including the papers [27, 37, 26, 18, 17]. However, despite the wide-spread use of the GLRT, its optimality properties have yet to be fully understood. For suitably regular problems, there is a great deal of asymptotic theory on the GLRT, and in particular when its distribution under the null is independent of nuisance parameters (e.g., [3, 42, 39]). On the other hand, there are some isolated cases in which the GLRT can be shown to dominated by other tests (e.g., [52, 33, 32, 26]).

In this paper, we undertake an in-depth study of the GLRT in application to a particular class of composite testing problems of a geometric flavor. In this class of testing problems, the null and alternative hypotheses are specified by a pair of closed convex cones C_1 and C_2, taken to be nested as $C_1 \subset C_2$. Suppose that we are given an observation of the form $y = \theta + w$, where w is a zero-mean Gaussian noise vector. Based on observing y, our goal is to test whether a given parameter θ belongs to the smaller cone C_1—corresponding to the null hypothesis—or belongs to the larger cone C_2. Cone testing problems of this type arise in many different settings, and there is a fairly substantial literature on the behavior of the GLRT in application to such problems (e.g., see the papers and books [8, 25, 40, 39, 41, 44, 35, 33, 34, 14, 47, 52], as well as references therein).

1.1 Some motivating examples

Before proceeding, let us consider some concrete examples so as to motivate our study.

Example 1 (Testing non-negativity and monotonicity in treatment effects)**.** Suppose that we have a collection of d treatments, say different drugs for a particular medical condition. Letting $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the mean of treatment j, one null hypothesis could be that none of treatments has any effect—that is, $\theta_j = 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, d$. Assuming that none of the treatments are directly harmful, a reasonable alternative would be that θ belongs to the *non-negative orthant cone*

$$K_+ := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_j \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \ldots, d\big\}. \tag{1}$$

This set-up leads to a particular instance of our general set-up with $C_1 = \{0\}$ and $C_2 = K_+$. Such orthant testing problems have been studied by Kudo [25] and Raubertas et al. [39], among other people.

In other applications, our treatments might consist of an ordered set of dosages of the same drug. In this case, we might have reason to believe that if the drug has any effect, then the treatment means would obey a monotonicity constraint—that is, with higher dosages leading to greater treatment effects. One would then want to detect the presence or absence of such a dose response effect. Monotonicity constraints also arise in various types of econometric models, in which the effects of strategic interventions should be monotone with respect to parameters such as market size (e.g.,[13]). For applications of this flavor, a reasonable alternative would be specified by the *monotone cone*

$$M := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \;\mid\; \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 \leq \cdots \leq \theta_d\big\}. \tag{2}$$

This set-up leads to another instance of our general problem with $C_1 = \{0\}$ and $C_2 = M$. The behavior of the GLRT for this particular testing problem has also been studied in past works, including papers by Barlow et al. [3], and Raubertas et al. [39].

As a third instance of the treatment effects problem, we might like to include in our null hypothesis the possibility that the treatments have some (potentially) non-zero effect but one that remains constant across levels—i.e., $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \cdots = \theta_d$. In this case, our null hypothesis is specified by the *ray cone*

$$R := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \;\mid\; \theta = c\mathbf{1} \quad \text{for some } c \in \mathbb{R}\big\}. \tag{3}$$

Supposing that we are interested in testing the alternative that the treatments lead to a monotone effect, we arrive at another instance of our general set-up with $C_1 = R$ and $C_2 = M$. This testing problem has also been studied by Bartholomew [4, 5] and Robertson et al. [43] among other researchers.

Example 2 (Robust matched filtering in signal processing)**.** In radar detection problems [45], a standard goal is to detect the presence of a known signal of unknown amplitude in the presence of noise. After a matched filtering step, this problem can be reduced to a vector testing problem, where the known signal direction is defined by a vector $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d$, whereas the unknown amplitude corresponds to a scalar pre-factor $c \geq 0$. We thus arrive at a ray cone testing problem: the null hypothesis (corresponding to the absence of signal) is given $C_1 = \{0\}$, whereas the alternative is given by the positive ray cone $R_+ = \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta = c\gamma \text{ for some } c \geq 0\big\}$.

In many cases, there may be uncertainty about the target signal, or jamming by adversaries, who introduce additional signals that can be potentially confused with the target signal γ. Signal uncertainties of this type are often modeled by various forms of cones, with the most classical choice being a subspace cone [45]. In more recent work (e.g., [8, 20]), signal uncertainty has been modeled using the *circular cone* defined by the target signal direction, namely

$$C(\gamma; \alpha) := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \;\mid\; \langle \gamma, \theta \rangle \geq \cos(\alpha)\, \|\gamma\|_2 \|\theta\|_2\big\}, \tag{4}$$

corresponding to the set of all vectors θ that have angle at least α with the target signal. Thus, we are led to another instance of a cone testing problem involving a circular cone.

Example 3 (Cone-constrained testing in linear regression)**.** Consider the standard linear regression model

$$y = X\beta + \sigma Z, \qquad \text{where } Z \sim N(0, I_n), \tag{5}$$

where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is a fixed and known design matrix. In many applications, we are interested in testing certain properties of the unknown regression vector β, and these can often be encoded in terms of cone-constraints on the vector $\theta := X\beta$. As a very simple example, the problem of testing whether or not $\beta = 0$ versus an unrestricted alternative corresponds to testing whether $\theta \in C_1 := \{0\}$ versus the alternative that $\theta \in C_2 := \text{range}(X)$. Thus, we arrive at a *subspace testing problem* which is same as testing the global null studied in linear regression literature (e.g., [10]). If instead, we consider the case when the p-dimensional vector β lies in the non-negative orthant cone (1), then our alternative for the n-dimensional vector θ becomes the *polyhedral cone*

$$P := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \theta = X\beta \quad \text{for some } \beta \geq 0\big\}. \tag{6}$$

The corresponding estimation problem with non-negative constraint has been studied by Slawski et al. [48] and Meinshausen [31]; see also Chen et al. [12] for a survey of this line of work. In addition to these preceding two cases, we can also test various other types of cone alternatives for β, and these are transformed via the design matrix X into other types of cones for the parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Example 4 (Testing shape-constrained departures from parametric models)**.** Our third example is non-parametric in flavor. Consider the class of functions f that can be decomposed as

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j \phi_j + \psi. \tag{7}$$

Here the known functions $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^k$ define a linear space, parameterized by the coefficient vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$, whereas the unknown function ψ models a structured departure from this linear parametric class. For instance, we might assume that ψ belongs to the class of monotone functions, or the class of convex functions. Given a fixed collection of design points $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^n$, suppose that we make observations of the form $y_i = f(t_i) + \sigma g_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, where each g_i is a standard normal variable. Defining the shorthand notation $\theta := \big(f(t_1), \ldots, f(t_n)\big)$ and $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_n)$, our observations can be expressed in the standard form $y = \theta + \sigma g$. If, under the null hypothesis, the function f satisfies the decomposition (7) with $\psi = 0$, then the vector θ must belong to the subspace $\{\Phi a \mid a \in \mathbb{R}^k\}$, where the matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ has entries $\Phi_{ij} = \phi_j(x_i)$.

Now suppose that the alternative is that f satisfies the decomposition (7) with some ψ that is convex. A convexity constraint on ψ implies that we can write $\theta = \Phi a + \gamma$, for some coefficients $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and a vector $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n$ belonging to the *convex cone*

$$V(\{t_i\}_{i=1}^n) := \Big\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \frac{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{t_2 - t_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_3 - \gamma_2}{t_3 - t_2} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{\gamma_n - \gamma_{n-1}}{t_n - t_{n-1}}\Big\}. \tag{8}$$

This particular cone testing problem and other forms of shape constraints have been studied by Meyer [35], as well as by Sen and Meyer [46].

1.2 Problem formulation

Having understood the range of motivations for our problem, let us now set up the problem more precisely. Suppose that we are given observations of the form $y = \theta + \sigma g$, where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a fixed but unknown vector, whereas $g \sim N(0, I_d)$ is a d-dimensional vector of i.i.d. Gaussian entries. Our goal is to distinguish the null hypothesis that $\theta \in C_1$ versus the alternative that $\theta \in C_2 \backslash C_1$, where $C_1 \subset C_2$ are a nested pair of closed, convex cones in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

In this paper, we study both the fundamental limits of solving this composite testing problem, as well as the performance of a specific procedure, namely the *generalized likelihood ratio test*, or GLRT for short. By definition, the GLRT for the problem of distinguishing between cones C_1 and C_2 is based on the statistic

$$T(y) := -2 \log \left(\frac{\sup_{\theta \in C_1} \mathbb{P}_\theta(y)}{\sup_{\theta \in C_2} \mathbb{P}_\theta(y)} \right). \tag{9a}$$

It defines a family of tests, parameterized by a threshold parameter $\beta \in [0, \infty)$, of the form

$$\phi_\beta(y) := \mathbb{I}(T(y) \geq \beta) \; = \; \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } T(y) \geq \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9b}$$

Thus far, our formulation of the testing problem allows for the possibility that θ lies in the set $C_2 \backslash C_1$, but is arbitrarily close to some element of C_1. Thus, under this formulation, it is not possible to make any non-trivial assertions about the power of the GLRT nor any other test in a uniform sense. Accordingly, so as to be able to make quantitative statements about the performance of different statements, we exclude a certain ϵ-ball from the alternative. This procedure leads to the notion of the *minimax testing radius* associated this composite decision problem. This minimax formulation was introduced in the seminal work of Ingster and co-authors [22, 23]; since then, it has been studied by many authors (e.g., [16, 49, 28, 29, 2]).

For a given $\epsilon > 0$, we define the *ϵ-fattening* of the cone C_1 as

$$B_2(C_1; \epsilon) := \big\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \; | \; \min_{u \in C_1} \|\theta - u\|_2 \leq \epsilon \big\}, \tag{10}$$

corresponding to the set of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are at most Euclidean distance ϵ from some element of C_1. We then consider the testing problem of distinguishing between the two hypotheses

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta \in C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta \in C_2 \backslash B_2(C_1; \epsilon). \tag{11}$$

To be clear, the parameter $\epsilon > 0$ is a quantity that is used during the course of our analysis in order to titrate the difficulty of the testing problem. All of the tests that we consider, including the GLRT, are not given knowledge of ϵ. Let us introduce shorthand $\mathcal{T}(C_1, C_2; \epsilon)$ to denote this testing problem (11).

Obviously, the testing problem (11) becomes more difficult as ϵ approaches zero, and so it is natural to study this increase in quantitative terms. Letting $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \{0, 1\}$ be any (measurable) test function, we measure its performance in terms of its *uniform error*

$$\mathcal{E}(\psi; C_1, C_2, \epsilon) := \sup_{\theta \in C_1} \mathbb{E}_\theta[\psi(y)] + \sup_{\theta \in C_2 \backslash B_2(\epsilon; C_1)} \mathbb{E}_\theta[1 - \psi(y)], \tag{12}$$

which controls the worst-case error over both null and alternative.

For a given error level $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we are interested in the smallest setting of ϵ for which either the GLRT, or some other test ψ has uniform error at most ρ. More precisely, we define

$$\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(C_1, C_2; \rho) := \inf \Big\{ \epsilon \; | \; \inf_{\psi} \mathcal{E}(\psi; C_1, C_2, \epsilon) \leq \rho \Big\}, \quad \text{and} \tag{13a}$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{GLR}}(C_1, C_2; \rho) := \inf \Big\{ \epsilon \; | \; \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{E}(\phi_\beta; C_1, C_2, \epsilon) \leq \rho \Big\}. \tag{13b}$$

When the subspace-cone pair (C_1, C_2) are clear from the context, we occasionally omit this dependence, and write $\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(\rho)$ and $\epsilon_{\text{GLR}}(\rho)$ instead. We refer to these two quantities as the *minimax testing radius* and the *GLRT testing radius* respectively.

By definition, the minimax testing radius ϵ_{OPT} corresponds to the smallest separation ϵ at which there exists *some test* that distinguishes between the hypotheses $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ in equation (11) with uniform error at most ρ. Thus, it provides a fundamental characterization of the statistical difficulty of the hypothesis testing. On the other hand, the GLRT testing radius $\epsilon_{\mathrm{GLR}}(\rho)$ provides us with the smallest radius ϵ for which there exists *some threshold*—say β^*— for which the associated generalized likelihood ratio test ϕ_{β^*} distinguishes between the hypotheses with error at most ρ. Thus, it characterizes the performance limits of the GLRT when an optimal threshold β^* is chosen. Of course, by definition, we always have $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\rho) \leq \epsilon_{\mathrm{GLR}}(\rho)$. We write $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\rho) \asymp \epsilon_{\mathrm{GLR}}(\rho)$ to mean that—in addition to the previous upper bound—there is also a lower bound $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\rho) \geq c_\rho \epsilon_{\mathrm{GLR}}(\rho)$ that matches up to a constant $c_\rho > 0$ depending only on ρ.

1.3 Overview of our results

Having set up the problem, let us now provide a high-level overview of the main results of this paper.

- Our first main result, stated as Theorem 1 in Section 3.1, gives a sharp characterization—meaning upper and lower bounds that match up to universal constants—of the GLRT testing radius ϵ_{GLR} for cone pairs (C_1, C_2) that are non-oblique (we discuss the non-obliqueness property and its significance at length in Section 2.2). We illustrate the consequences of this theorem for a number of concrete cones, include the subspace cone, orthant cone, monotone cone, circular cone and a Cartesian product cone.
- In our second main result, stated as Theorem 2 in Section 3.2, we derive a lower bound that applies to any testing function. It leads to a corollary that provides sufficient conditions for the GLRT to be an optimal test, and we use it to establish optimality for the subspace cone and circular cone, among other examples. We then revisit the Cartesian product cone, first analyzed in the context of Theorem 1, and use Theorem 2 to show that the GLRT is sub-optimal for this particular cone, even though it is in no sense a pathological example.
- For the monotone and orthant cones, we find that the lower bound established in Theorem 2 is not sharp, but that the GLRT turns out to be an optimal test. Thus, Section 3.3 is devoted to a detailed analysis of these two cases, in particular using a more refined argument to obtain sharp lower bounds.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides background on conic geometry, including conic projections, the Moreau decomposition, and the notion of Gaussian width. It also introduces the notion of a non-oblique pair of cones, which have been studied in the context of the GLRT. In Section 3, we state our main results and illustrate their consequences via a series of examples. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 are devoted, respectively, to our sharp characterization of the GLRT and a general lower bound on the minimax testing radius. Section 3.3 explores the monotone and orthant cones in more detail. In Section 4, we provide the proofs of our main results, with certain more technical aspects deferred to the appendices.

Notation: Here we summarize some notation used throughout the remainder of this paper. For functions $f(\sigma, d)$ and $g(\sigma, d)$, we write $f(\sigma, d) \lesssim g(\sigma, d)$ to indicate that $f(\sigma, d) \leq c g(\sigma, d)$ for some constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ that may only depend on ρ but independent of (σ, d), and similarly for $f(\sigma, d) \gtrsim g(\sigma, d)$. We write $f(\sigma, d) \asymp g(\sigma, d)$ if both $f(\sigma, d) \lesssim g(\sigma, d)$ and $f(\sigma, d) \gtrsim g(\sigma, d)$ are satisfied.

2 Background on conic geometry and the GLRT

In this section, we provide some necessary background on cones and their geometry, including the notion of a polar cone and the Moreau decomposition. We also define the notion of a non-oblique pair of cones, and summarize some known results about properties of the GLRT for such cone testing problems.

2.1 Convex cones and Gaussian widths

For a given closed convex cone $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the Euclidean projection operator $\Pi_C : \mathbb{R}^d \to C$ via

$$\Pi_C(v) := \arg\min_{u \in C} \|v - u\|_2. \tag{14}$$

By standard properties of projection onto closed convex sets, we are guaranteed that this mapping is well-defined. We also define the polar cone

$$C^* := \big\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle v, u \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in C \big\}. \tag{15}$$

Figure 1(b) provides an illustration of a cone in comparison to its polar cone. Using Π_{C^*} to denote the projection operator onto this cone, Moreau's theorem [36] ensures that every vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ can be decomposed as

$$v = \Pi_C(v) + \Pi_{C^*}(v), \quad \text{and moreover that } \langle \Pi_C(v), \Pi_{C^*}(v) \rangle = 0. \tag{16}$$

We make frequent use of this decomposition in our analysis.

Let $S^{d-1} := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|u\|_2 = 1\}$ denotes the Euclidean sphere of unit radius. For every set $A \subseteq S^{d-1}$, we define its *Gaussian width* as

$$\mathbb{W}(A) := \mathbb{E}\big[\sup_{u \in A} \langle u, g \rangle \big] \qquad \text{where } g \sim N(0, I_d). \tag{17}$$

This quantity provides a measure of the size of the set A; indeed, it can be related to the volume of A viewed as a subset of the Euclidean sphere. The notion of Gaussian width arises in many different areas, notably in early work on probabilistic methods in Banach spaces [38]; the Gaussian complexity, along with its close relative the Rademacher complexity, plays a central role in empirical process theory [50, 24, 6].

Of interest in this paper are the Gaussian widths of sets of the form $A = C \cap S^{d-1}$, where C is a closed convex cone. For a set of this form, using the Moreau decomposition (16), we have the useful equivalence

$$\mathbb{W}(C \cap S^{d-1}) \;=\; \mathbb{E}\big[\sup_{u \in C \cap S^{d-1}} \langle u, \Pi_C(g) + \Pi_{C^*}(g) \rangle \big] \;=\; \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_C(g)\|_2, \tag{18}$$

where the final equality uses the fact that $\langle u, \Pi_{C^*}(g) \rangle \leq 0$ for all vectors $u \in C$, with equality holding when u is a non-negative scalar multiple of $\Pi_C(g)$.

For future reference, let us derive a lower bound on $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_C g\|_2$ that holds for every cone C strictly larger than $\{0\}$. Take some non-zero vector $u \in C$ and let $R_+ = \{cu \mid c \geq 0\}$ be the ray that it defines. Since $R_+ \subseteq C$, we have $\|\Pi_C g\|_2 \geq \|\Pi_{R_+} g\|_2$. But since R_+ is just a ray, the projection $\Pi_{R_+}(g)$ is a standard normal variable truncated to be positive, and hence

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_C g\|_2 \geq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{R_+} g\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}}. \tag{19}$$

This lower bound is useful in parts of our development.

2.2 Cone-based GLRTs and non-oblique pairs

In this section, we provide some background on the notion of non-oblique pairs of cones, and their significance for the GLRT. First, let us exploit some properties of closed convex cones in order to derive a simpler expression for the GLRT test statistic (9a). Using the form of the multivariate Gaussian density, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(y) \;=\; \min_{\theta \in C_1} \|y - \theta\|_2^2 - \min_{\theta \in C_2} \|y - \theta\|_2^2 &= \|y - \Pi_{C_1}(y)\|_2^2 - \|y - \Pi_{C_2}(y)\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\Pi_{C_2}(y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_{C_1}(y)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have made use of the Moreau decomposition to assert that

$$\|y - \Pi_{C_1}(y)\|_2^2 = \|y\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_{C_1}(y)\|_2^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|y - \Pi_{C_2}(y)\|_2^2 = \|y\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_{C_2}(y)\|_2^2.$$

Thus, we see that a cone-based GLRT has a natural interpretation: it compares the squared amplitude of the projection of y onto the two different cones.

When $C_1 = \{0\}$, then it can be shown that under the null hypothesis (i.e., $y \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$), the statistic $T(y)$ is a mixture of χ^2-distributions (see e.g., [39]). On the other hand, for a general cone pair (C_1, C_2), it is not straightforward to characterize the distribution of $T(y)$ under the null hypothesis. Thus, past work has studied conditions on the cone pair under which the null distribution has a simple characterization. One such condition is a certain non-obliqueness property, which we now discuss. Another motivation for imposing this non-obliqueness condition is that there are known instances of oblique cone pairs (e.g., [52, 33, 21]) for which the GLRT can be shown to dominated by other tests.

A nested pair of closed convex cones $C_1 \subset C_2$ is said to be *non-oblique* if we have the successive projection property

$$\Pi_{C_1}(x) = \Pi_{C_1}(\Pi_{C_2}(x)) \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{20}$$

For instance, this condition holds whenever one of the two cones is a subspace, or more generally, whenever there is a subspace L such that $C_1 \subseteq L \subseteq C_2$—for instance see Hu and Wright [21] for details of this latter property.

The significance of the non-obliqueness condition lies in the following decomposition result. For any nested pair of closed convex cones $C_1 \subset C_2$ that are non-oblique, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\Pi_{C_2}(x) = \Pi_{C_1}(x) + \Pi_{C_2 \cap C_1^*}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \Pi_{C_1}(x), \Pi_{C_2 \cap C_1^*}(x) \rangle = 0. \tag{21}$$

This decomposition follows from general theory due to Zarantonello [54], who proves that for non-oblique cones, we have $\Pi_{C_2 \cap C_1^*} = \Pi_{C_1^*} \Pi_{C_2}$—see Theorem 5.2 in his paper.

An immediate consequence of the decomposition (21) is that the GLRT for any non-oblique cone pair (C_1, C_2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} T(y) = \|\Pi_{C_2}(y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_{C_1}(y)\|_2^2 &= \|\Pi_{C_2 \cap C_1^*}(y)\|_2^2 \\ &= \|y\|_2^2 - \min_{\theta \in C_2 \cap C_1^*} \|y - \theta\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we see that the GLRT for the pair (C_1, C_2) is equivalent—namely, determined by the same statistic—to the GLRT for testing the *reduced hypothesis*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 : \theta = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 : \theta \in \big(C_2 \cap C_1^*\big) \backslash B_2(\epsilon). \tag{22}$$

Following the previous notation, write it as $\mathcal{T}(\{0\}, C_2 \cap C_1^*; \epsilon)$ and we make frequent use of this convenient reduction in the sequel.

3 Main results and their consequences

We now turn to the statement of our main results, along with a discussion of some of their consequences. Section 3.1 provides a sharp characterization of the minimax radius for the generalized likelihood ratio test up to a universal constant, along with a number of concrete examples. In Section 3.2, we state and prove a general lower bound on the performance of any test, and use it to establish the optimality of the GLRT in certain settings, as well as its sub-optimality in other settings. In Section 3.3, we revisit and study in details two cones of particular interest, namely the orthant and monotone cones.

3.1 Analysis of the generalized likelihood ratio test

Let (C_1, C_2) be a nested pair of closed cones $C_1 \subseteq C_2$ that are non-oblique (20). Consider the polar cone C_1^* as well as the intersection cone $K = C_2 \cap C_1^*$. Letting $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote a standard Gaussian random vector, we then define the quantity

$$\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2) := \min\left\{ \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2, \quad \Big(\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{\max\{0, \inf\limits_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle\}}\Big)^2 \right\}. \tag{23}$$

Note that $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ is a purely geometric object, depending on the pair (C_1, C_2) via the new cone $K = C_2 \cap C_1^*$, which arises due to the GLRT equivalence (22) discussed previously.

Recall that the GLRT is based on applying a threshold, at some level $\beta \in [0, \infty)$, to the likelihood ratio statistic $T(y)$—in particular, see equations (9a) and (9b). In the following theorem, we study the performance of the GLRT in terms of the the uniform testing error $\mathcal{E}(\phi_\beta; C_1, C_2, \epsilon)$ from equation (12). In particular, we show that the critical testing radius for the GLRT is governed by the geometric parameter $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$.

Theorem 1. *There are numbers $\{(b_\rho, B_\rho), \rho \in (0, 1/2)\}$ such that, for every pair of non-oblique closed convex cones (C_1, C_2) with C_1 strictly contained within C_2:*

(a) For every error probability $\rho \in (0, 0.5)$, we have

$$\inf_{\beta \in [0,\infty)} \mathcal{E}(\phi_\beta; C_1, C_2, \epsilon) \leq \rho \qquad \text{for all } \epsilon^2 \geq B_\rho \, \sigma^2 \, \delta^2_{LR}(C_1, C_2). \tag{24a}$$

(b) Conversely, for every error probability $\rho \in (0, 0.11]$, we have

$$\inf_{\beta \in [0,\infty)} \mathcal{E}(\phi_\beta; C_1, C_2, \epsilon) \geq \rho \qquad \text{for all } \epsilon^2 \leq b_\rho \, \sigma^2 \, \delta^2_{LR}(C_1, C_2). \tag{24b}$$

Remarks: While our proof leads to universal values for the constants B_ρ and b_ρ, we have made no efforts to obtain the sharpest possible ones, so do not state them here. In any case, our main interest is to understand the scaling of the testing radius with respect to σ and the geometric parameters of the problem. In terms of the GLRT testing radius ϵ_{GLR} previously defined (13b), Theorem 1 establishes that

$$\epsilon_{\text{GLR}}(C_1, C_2; \rho) \asymp \sigma \, \delta_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2), \tag{25}$$

where $\asymp$ denotes equality up to constants depending on ρ, but independent of all other problem parameters. Since ϵ_{GLR} always upper bounds ϵ_{OPT} for every fixed level ρ, we can also conclude from Theorem 1 that

$$\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(C_1, C_2; \rho) \lesssim \sigma \, \delta_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2).$$

It is worthwhile noting that the quantity $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ depends on the pair (C_1, C_2) only via the new cone $K = C_2 \cap C_1^*$. Indeed, as discussed in Section 2.2, for any pair of non-oblique closed convex cones, the GLRT for the original testing problem (11) is equivalent to the GLRT for the modified testing problem $\mathcal{T}(\{0\}, K; \epsilon)$.

3.1.1 Consequences for convex set alternatives

Although Theorem 1 applies to cone-based testing problems, it also has some implications for a more general class of problems based on convex set alternatives. In particular, suppose that we are interested in the testing problem of distinguishing between

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta = \theta_0, \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta \in \mathcal{S}, \tag{26}$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ is a not necessarily a cone, but rather an arbitrary closed convex set, and θ_0 is some vector such that $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. Consider the tangent cone of $\mathcal{S}$ at θ_0, which is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta) := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \text{there exists some } t > 0 \text{ such that } \theta + tu \in \mathcal{S}\}. \tag{27}$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0)$ contains the shifted set $\mathcal{S} - \theta_0$. Consequently, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, \mathcal{S} - \theta_0, \epsilon) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\theta=0}[\psi(y)] + \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0) \setminus B_2(0;\epsilon)} \mathbb{E}_\theta[1 - \psi(y)] \;=\; \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0), \epsilon),$$

which shows that the tangent cone testing problem

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \; \theta = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \; \theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0), \tag{28}$$

is more challenging than the original problem (26). Thus, applying Theorem 1 to this cone-testing problem (28), we obtain the following:

Corollary 1. *For the convex set testing problem* (26)*, we have*

$$\epsilon^2_{OPT}(\theta_0, \mathcal{S}; \rho) \lesssim \sigma^2 \min\left\{ \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0)} g\|_2, \quad \Big(\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0)} g\|_2}{\max\{0, \inf\limits_{\eta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0) \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \, \mathbb{E}\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}(\theta_0)} g \rangle\}} \Big)^2 \right\}. \tag{29}$$

This upper bound can be achieved by applying the GLRT to the tangent cone testing problem (28)*.*

This corollary offers a general recipe of upper bounding the optimal testing radius. In Subsection 3.1.6, we provide an application of Corollary 1 to the problem of testing

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta = \theta_0 \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta \in M,$$

where M is the monotone cone (defined in expression (2)). When $\theta_0 \neq 0$, this is not a cone testing problem, since the set $\{\theta_0\}$ is not a cone. Using Corollary 1, we prove an upper bound on the optimal testing radius for this problem in terms of the number of constant pieces of θ_0.

In the remainder of this section, we consider some special cases of testing a cone K versus $\{0\}$ in order to illustrate the consequences of Theorem 1. In all cases, we compute the GLRT testing radius for a constant error probability, and so ignore the dependencies on ρ. For this reason, we adopt the more streamlined notation $\epsilon_{\text{GLR}}(K)$ for the radius $\epsilon_{\text{GLR}}(\{0\}, K; \rho)$.

3.1.2 Subspace of dimension k

Let us begin with an especially simple case—namely, when K is equal to a subspace S_k of dimension $k \leq d$. In this case, the projection Π_K is a linear operator, which can be represented by matrix multiplication using a rank k projection matrix. By symmetry of the Gaussian distribution, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Pi_K g] = 0$. Moreover, by rotation invariance of the Gaussian distribution, the random vector $\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2$ follows a χ^2-distribution with k degrees of freedom, whence

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{2} \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \;\leq\; \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2} \;=\; \sqrt{k}.$$

Applying Theorem 1 then yields that the testing radius of the GLRT scales as

$$\epsilon^2_{\text{GLR}}(S_k) \asymp \sigma^2 \sqrt{k}. \tag{30}$$

Here our notation $\asymp$ denotes equality up to constants independent of (σ, k); we have omitted dependence on the testing error ρ so as to simplify notation, and will do so throughout our discussion.

3.1.3 Circular cone

A circular cone in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with constant angle $\alpha \in (0, \pi/2)$ is given by $\text{Circ}_d(\alpha) := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_1 \geq \|\theta\|_2 \cos(\alpha)\}$. In geometric terms, it corresponds to the set of all vectors whose angle with the standard basis vector $e_1 = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is at most α radians. Figure 1(a) gives an illustration of a circular cone.



Figure 1: (a) A 3-dimensional circular cone with angle α. (b) Illustration of a cone versus its polar cone.

Suppose that we want to test the null hypothesis $\theta = 0$ versus the cone alternative $K = \text{Circ}_d(\alpha)$. We claim that, in application to this particular cone, Theorem 1 implies that

$$\epsilon^2_{\text{GLR}}(K) \asymp \sigma^2 \min\left\{\sqrt{d}, 1\right\} \;=\; \sigma^2, \tag{31}$$

where $\asymp$ denotes equality up to constants depending on (ρ, α), but independent of all other problem parameters.

In order to apply Theorem 1, we need to evaluate both terms that define the geometric quantity $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$. On one hand, by symmetry of the cone $K = \text{Circ}_d(\alpha)$ in its last $(d-1)$-coordinates, we have $\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g = \beta e_1$ for some scalar $\beta > 0$ and e_1 denotes the standard Euclidean basis vector with a 1 in the first coordinate. Moreover, for any $\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}$, we have $\eta_1 \geq \cos(\alpha)$, and hence

$$\inf_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle = \eta_1 \beta \geq \cos(\alpha)\beta \;=\; \cos(\alpha)\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2.$$

Next, we claim that $\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2 \asymp \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2$. In order to prove this claim, note that Jensen's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2 \overset{(a)}{\geq} (\mathbb{E}\Pi_{\text{Circ}_d(\alpha)} g)_1 = \mathbb{E}(\Pi_{\text{Circ}_d(\alpha)} g)_1 \overset{(b)}{\geq} \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\text{Circ}_d(\alpha)} g\|_2 \cos(\alpha), \tag{32}$$

where in this argument, inequality (a) follows from simply fact that $\|x\|_2 \geq |x_1|$ whereas inequality (b) follows from the definition of circular cone. Plugging into definition $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$, the corresponding second term equals to a constant. Therefore, the second term in the definition (23) of $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ is upper bounded by a constant, independent of the dimension d.

On the other hand, from known results on circular cones (see §6.3, [30]), there are constants $\kappa_j = \kappa_j(\alpha)$ for $j = 1, 2$ such that $\kappa_1 d \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 \;\leq\; \kappa_2 d$. Moreover, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 - 4 \overset{(a)}{\leq} (\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2 \overset{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2.$$

Here inequality (b) is an immediate consequence of Jensen's inequality, whereas inequality (a) follows from the fact that $\mathrm{var}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \leq 4$—see Lemma 2 in Section 4.1 and the surrounding discussion for details. Putting together the pieces, we see that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{d}$ for the circular cone. Combining different elements of our argument leads to the stated claim (31).

3.1.4 A Cartesian product cone

We now consider a simple extension of the previous two examples—namely, a convex cone formed by taking the Cartesian product of the real line $\mathbb{R}$ with the circular cone $\mathrm{Circ}_{d-1}(\alpha)$—that is

$$K_\times := \mathrm{Circ}_{d-1}(\alpha) \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{33}$$

This example turns out to be rather interesting because—as will be demonstrated in Section 3.2.3—the GLRT is sub-optimal by a factor $\sqrt{d}$ for this cone. In order to set up this later analysis, here we use Theorem 1 to prove that

$$\epsilon^2_{\mathrm{GLR}}(K_\times) \asymp \sigma^2\sqrt{d}. \tag{34}$$

Note that this result is strongly suggestive of sub-optimality on the part of the GLRT. More concretely, the two cones that form $K_\times$ are both "easy", in that the GLRT radius scales as σ^2 for each. For this reason, one would expect that the squared radius of an optimal test would scale as σ^2—as opposed to the $\sigma^2\sqrt{d}$ of the GLRT—and our later calculations will show that this is indeed the case.

We now prove claim (34) as a consequence of Theorem 1. First notice that projecting to the product cone $K_\times$ can be viewed as projecting the first $d-1$ dimension to circular cone $\mathrm{Circ}_{d-1}(\alpha)$ and the last coordinate to $\mathbb{R}$. Consequently, we have the following inequality

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathrm{Circ}_{d-1}(\alpha)} g\|_2 \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{K_\times} g\|_2 \;\overset{(a)}{\leq}\; \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{K_\times} g\|_2^2} = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathrm{Circ}_{d-1}(\alpha)} g\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E}[g_d^2]}.$$

where inequality (a) follows by Jensen's inequality. Making use of our previous calculations for the circular cone, we have $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{K_\times} g\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{d}$. Moreover, note that the last coordinate of $\mathbb{E}[\Pi_{K_\times} g]$ is equal to 0 by symmetry and the standard basis vector $e_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with a single one in its last coordinate, belongs to $K_\times \cap S^{d-1}$, we have

$$\inf_{\eta \in K_\times \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times}(g)\rangle \leq \langle e_d, \mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times}(g)\rangle = 0.$$

Plugging into definition $\delta^2_{\mathrm{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$, the corresponding second term equals infinity. Therefore the minimal of $\delta^2_{\mathrm{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ is achieved in the first term namely scales with $\sqrt{d}$. Putting together the pieces yields the claim (34).

3.1.5 Non-negative orthant cone

Next let us consider the (non-negative) orthant cone given by $K_+ := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_j \geq 0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, d\big\}$. Here we use Theorem 1 to show that

$$\epsilon^2_{\mathrm{GLR}}(K_+) \asymp \sigma^2\sqrt{d}. \tag{35}$$

To evaluate quantity $\delta^2_{\mathrm{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$, it is straightforward to see that $[\Pi_{K_+}(\theta)]_j = \max\{0, \theta_j\}$, and hence $\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_+}(g) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}|g_1|\,\mathbf{1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,\mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of all ones. Thus, we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_+}(g)\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{d}{2\pi}}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_+}(g)\|_2 \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{K_+}(g)\|_2 \;\leq\; \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{K_+}(g)\|_2^2} = \sqrt{\frac{d}{2}},$$

where the second inequality follows from Jensen's inequality. So the first term in the definition of quantity $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ is proportional to $\sqrt{d}$. As for the second term, since the standard basis vector $e_1 \in K_+ \cap S^{d-1}$, we have

$$\inf_{\eta \in K_+ \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \leq \langle e_1, \, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \, \mathbf{1} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

Consequently, the second term in the definition of quantity $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ lower bounded by a universal constant times d. Combining these derivations yields the stated claim (35).

3.1.6 Monotone cone

As our final example, consider testing in the monotone cone given by $M := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 \leq \cdots \leq \theta_d\big\}$. Testing with monotone cone constraint has also been studied in different settings before, where it is known in some cases that restricting to monotone cone helps reduce the hardness of the problem to be logarithmically dependent on the dimension (e.g., [7, 53]).

Here we use Theorem 1 to show that

$$\epsilon^2_{\text{GLR}}(M) \asymp \sigma^2 \sqrt{\log d}. \tag{36}$$

From known results on monotone cone (see §3.5, [1]), we know that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_M g\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{\log d}$. So the only remaining detail is to control the second term defining $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$. We claim that the second term is actually infinity since

$$\max\{0, \quad \inf_{\eta \in M \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \, \mathbb{E}\Pi_M g \rangle\} = 0, \tag{37}$$

which can be seen by simply noticing vectors $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{1}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{1} \in M \cap S^{d-1}$ and

$$\min\Big\{\langle \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\sqrt{d}}, \, \mathbb{E}\Pi_M g \rangle, \quad \langle -\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\sqrt{d}}, \, \mathbb{E}\Pi_M g \rangle\Big\} \leq 0.$$

Here $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the vector of all ones. Combining the pieces yields the claim (36).

Testing constant versus monotone: It is worth noting that the same GLRT bound also holds for the more general problem of testing the monotone cone M versus the linear subspace $L = \text{span}(\mathbf{1})$ of constant vectors, namely:

$$\epsilon^2_{\text{GLR}}(L, M) \asymp \sigma^2 \sqrt{\log d}. \tag{38}$$

In particular, the following lemma provides the control that we need:

Lemma 1. *For the monotone cone M and the linear space $L = span(\mathbf{1})$, there is a universal constant c such that*

$$\inf_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \leq c, \qquad K := M \cap L^{\perp}.$$

See Appendix E.1 for the proof of this lemma.

Testing an arbitrary vector θ_0 versus the monotone cone: Finally, let us consider an important implication of Corollary 1 in the context of testing departures in monotone cone. More precisely, for a fixed vector $\theta_0 \in M$, consider the testing problem

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta = \theta_0, \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta \in M, \tag{39}$$

Let us define $k(\theta_0)$ as the number of constant *pieces* of θ_0, by which we mean there exist integers $d_1, \ldots, d_{k(\theta_0)}$ with $d_i \geq 1$ and $d_1 + \cdots + d_{k(\theta_0)} = d$ such that θ_0 is a constant on each set $S_i := \{j : \sum_{t=1}^{i-1} d_t + 1 \leq j \leq \sum_{t=1}^{i} d_i\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq k(\theta_0)$.

We claim that Corollary 1 guarantees that the optimal testing radius satisfies

$$\epsilon^2_{\text{OPT}}(\theta_0, M; \rho) \lesssim \sigma^2 \sqrt{k(\theta_0) \log\left(\frac{d}{k(\theta_0)}\right)}. \tag{40}$$

Note that this upper bound depends on the structure of θ_0 through how many pieces θ_0 possesses, which reveals the adaptive nature of Corollary 1.

In order to prove inequality (40), let us use shorthand k to denote $k(\theta_0)$. First notice that both $\mathbf{1}/\sqrt{d}, -\mathbf{1}/\sqrt{d} \in \mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0)$, then

$$\max\{0, \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0) \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0)} g \rangle\} \leq 0,$$

which implies the second term for $\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ equals to infinity. It only remains to calculate $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0)} g\|_2$. Since the tangent cone $\mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0)$ equals to the Cartesian product of k monotone cones, namely $\mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0) = M_{d_1} \times \cdots \times M_{d_k}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0)} g\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{M_{d_1}} g\|_2^2 + \cdots + \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{M_{d_k}} g\|_2^2 = \log(d_1) + \cdots + \log(d_k) \leq k \log\left(\frac{d}{k}\right),$$

where the last step follows from convexity of the logarithm function. Therefore Jensen's inequality guarantees that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0)} g\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_M(\theta_0)} g\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{k \log\left(\frac{d}{k}\right)}.$$

Putting the pieces together, Corollary 1 guarantees that the claimed inequality (40) holds for the testing problem (39).

3.2 Lower bounds on the testing radius

Thus far, we have derived sharp bounds for a particular procedure—namely, the GLRT. Of course, it is of interest to understand when the GLRT is actually an optimal test, meaning that there is no other test that can discriminate between the null and alternative for smaller separations. In this section, we use information-theoretic methods to derive a lower bound on the optimal testing radius ϵ_{OPT} for every pair of non-oblique and nested closed convex cones (C_1, C_2). Similar to Theorem 1, this bound depends on the geometric structure of intersection cone $K := C_2 \cap C_1^*$, where C_1^* is the polar cone to C_1.

In particular, let us define the quantity

$$\delta^2_{\text{OPT}}(C_1, C_2) := \min\left\{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2, \quad \Big(\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{\sup_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle}\Big)^2\right\}. \tag{41}$$

Note that the only difference from $\delta^2_{\mathrm{LR}}(C_1, C_2)$ is the replacement of the infimum over $K \cap S^{d-1}$ with a supremum, in the denominator of the second term. Moreover, since the supremum is achieved at $\frac{\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g}{\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2}$, we have $\sup_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle = \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2$. Consequently, the second term on the right-hand side of equation (41) can be also written in the equivalent form $\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2}\right)^2$.

With this notation in hand, are now ready to state a general lower bound for minimax optimal testing radius:

Theorem 2. *There are numbers $\{\kappa_\rho, \rho \in (0, 1/2]\}$ such that for every nested pair of non-oblique closed convex cones $C_1 \subset C_2$, we have*

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathcal{E}(\psi; C_1, C_2, \epsilon) \geq \rho \qquad \text{whenever } \epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \, \sigma^2 \, \delta^2_{\mathit{OPT}}(C_1, C_2), \tag{42}$$

In particular, we can take $\kappa_\rho = 1/14$ for all $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$.

In more compact terms, Theorem 2 can be understood as guaranteeing

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(C_1, C_2; \rho) \gtrsim \sigma \delta_{\mathrm{OPT}}(C_1, C_2),$$

where $\gtrsim$ denotes an inequality up to constants (with ρ viewed as fixed).

One useful consequence of Theorem 2 is in providing a sufficient condition for optimality of the GLRT, which we summarize here:

Corollary 2 (Sufficient condition for optimality of GLRT)**.** *Given the cone $K = C_2 \cap C_1^*$, suppose that there is a numerical constant $b > 1$, independent of K and all other problem parameters, such that*

$$\sup_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \;=\; \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2 \;\leq b \inf_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle. \tag{43}$$

Then the GLRT is a minimax optimal test—that is, $\epsilon_{\mathit{GLR}}(C_1, C_2; \rho) \asymp \epsilon_{\mathit{OPT}}(C_1, C_2; \rho)$.

It is natural to wonder whether the condition (43) is also necessary for optimality of the GLRT. This turns out not to be the case. The monotone cone, to be revisited in Section 3.3.2, provides an instance of a cone testing problem for which the GLRT is optimal while condition (43) is violated. Let us now return to these concrete examples.

3.2.1 Revisiting the k-dimensional subspace

Let S_k be a subspace of dimension $k \leq d$. In our earlier discussion in Section 3.1.2, we established that $\epsilon^2_{\mathrm{GLR}}(S_k) \asymp \sigma^2 \sqrt{k}$. Let us use Corollary 2 to verify that the GLRT is optimal for this problem. For a k-dimensional subspace $K = S_k$, we have $\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g = 0$ by symmetry; consequently, condition (43) holds in a trivial manner. Thus, we conclude that $\epsilon^2_{\mathrm{OPT}}(S_k) \asymp \epsilon^2_{\mathrm{GLR}}(S_k)$, showing that the GLRT is optimal over all tests.

3.2.2 Revisiting the circular cone

Recall the circular cone $K = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_1 \geq \|\theta\|_2 \cos(\alpha)\}$ for fixed $0 < \alpha < \pi/2$. In our earlier discussion, we proved that $\epsilon^2_{\mathrm{GLR}}(K) \asymp \sigma^2$. Here let us verify that this scaling is optimal over all tests. By symmetry, we find that $\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g = \beta e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where e_1 denotes the standard Euclidean basis vector with a 1 in the first coordinate, and $\beta > 0$ is some scalar. For any vector $\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}$, we have $\eta_1 \geq \cos(\alpha)$, and hence

$$\inf_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \geq \cos(\alpha)\beta \;=\; \cos(\alpha) \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2.$$

Consequently, we see that condition (43) is satisfied with $b = \frac{1}{\cos(\alpha)} > 0$, so that the GLRT is optimal over all tests for each fixed α. (To be clear, in this example, our theory does not provide a sharp bound uniformly over varying α.)

3.2.3 Revisiting the product cone

Recall from Section 3.1.4 our discussion of the Cartesian product cone $K_\times = \mathrm{Circ}_{d-1}(\alpha) \times \mathbb{R}$. Let us first show that the sufficient condition (43) is violated, so that Corollary 2 does *not* imply optimality of the GLRT. From our earlier calculations, we know that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{K_\times} g\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{d}$. On the other hand, we also know that $\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times} g$ is equal to zero in its last coordinate. Since the standard basis vector e_d belongs to the set $K_\times \cap S^{d-1}$, we have

$$\inf_{\eta \in K_\times \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times} g \rangle \leq \langle e_d, \mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times} g \rangle \; = \; 0,$$

so that condition (43) does not hold.

From this calculation alone, we cannot conclude that the GLRT is sub-optimal. So let us now compute the lower bound guaranteed by Theorem 2. From our previous discussion, we know that $\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times} g = \beta e_1$ for some scalar $\beta > 0$. Moreover, we also have $\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times} g\|_2 = \beta \asymp \sqrt{d}$; this scaling follows because we have $\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_\times} g\|_2 = \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_{\mathrm{Circ}_{d-1}(\alpha)} g\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{d-1}$, where we have used the previous inequality (32) for circular cone. Putting together the pieces, we find that Theorem 2 implies that

$$\epsilon^2_{\mathrm{OPT}}(K_\times) \gtrsim \sigma^2, \tag{44}$$

which differs from the GLRT scaling in a factor of $\sqrt{d}$.

Does there exist a test that achieves the lower bound (44)? It turns out that a simple truncation test does so, and hence is optimal. To provide intuition for the test, observe that for any vector $\theta \in K_\times \cap S^{d-1}$, we have $\theta_1^2 + \theta_d^2 \geq \cos^2(\alpha)$. To verify this claim, note that

$$\frac{1}{\cos^2(\alpha)}\left(\theta_1^2 + \theta_d^2\right) \geq \frac{\theta_1^2}{\cos^2(\alpha)} + \theta_d^2 \; \geq \; \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \theta_j^2 + \theta_d^2 \; = \; 1.$$

Consequently, the two coordinates (y_1, y_d) provide sufficient information for constructing a good test. In particular, consider the truncation test

$$\varphi(y) := \mathbb{I}\big[\|(y_1, y_d)\|_2 \geq \beta\big],$$

for some threshold $\beta > 0$ to be determined. This can be viewed as a GLRT for testing the standard null against the alternative $\mathbb{R}^2$, and hence our general theory guarantees that it will succeed with separation $\epsilon^2 \gtrsim \sigma^2$. This guarantee matches our lower bound (44), showing that the truncation test is indeed optimal, and moreover, that the GLRT is sub-optimal by a factor of $\sqrt{d}$ for this particular problem.

3.3 Detailed analysis of two cases

This section is devoted to a detailed analysis of the orthant cone, followed by the monotone cone. Here we find that the GLRT is again optimal for both of these cones, but establishing this optimality requires a more delicate analysis.

3.3.1 Revisiting the orthant cone

Recall from Section 3.1.5 our discussion of the (non-negative) orthant cone

$$K_+ := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_j \geq 0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, d\},$$

where we proved that $\epsilon^2_{\text{GLR}}(K_+) \asymp \sigma^2\sqrt{d}$. Let us first show that the sufficient condition (43) does not hold, so that Corollary 2 does *not* imply optimality of the GLRT. As we have computed in our Section 3.1.5, quantity $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_{K_+}(g)\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{d}$ and

$$\inf_{\eta \in K_+ \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \leq \langle e_1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, \mathbf{1} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}},$$

where use the fact that $\mathbb{E}\Pi_{K_+}(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, \mathbf{1}$. So that condition (43) is violated.

Does this mean the GLRT is sub-optimal? It turns out that the GLRT is actually optimal over all tests, as we can demonstrate by proving a lower bound—tighter than the one given in Theorem 2—that matches the performance of the GLRT. We summarize it as follows:

Proposition 1. *There are numbers $\{\kappa_\rho, \rho \in (0, 1/2]\}$ such that for the (non-negative) orthant cone K_+, we have*

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, K_+, \epsilon) \geq \rho \qquad \textit{whenever } \epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho\, \sigma^2\sqrt{d}. \tag{45}$$

See Section 4.3 for the proof of this proposition.

From Proposition 1, we see that the optimal testing radius satisfies $\epsilon^2_{\text{OPT}}(K_+) \gtrsim \sigma^2\sqrt{d}$. Compared to the GLRT radius $\epsilon^2_{\text{GLR}}(K_+)$ established in expression (35), it implies the optimality of the GLRT.

3.3.2 Revisiting the monotone cone

Recall the monotone cone $M := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 \leq \cdots \leq \theta_d\}$. In our previous discussion in Section 3.1.6, we established that $\epsilon^2_{\text{GLR}}(M) \asymp \sigma^2\sqrt{\log d}$. We also pointed out that this scaling holds for a more general problem, namely, testing cone M versus linear subspace $L = \text{span}(\mathbf{1})$. In this section, we show that the GLRT is also optimal for both cases.

First, observe that Corollary 2 does not imply optimality of the GLRT. In particular, using symmetry of the inner product, we have shown in expression (37) that

$$\max\{0, \inf_{\eta \in M \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_M g \rangle\} = 0,$$

for cone pair $(C_1, C_2) = (\{0\}, M)$. Also note that from Lemma 1 we know that for cone pair $(C_1, C_2) = (\text{span}(\mathbf{1}), M)$, there is a universal constant c such that

$$\inf_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \leq c, \qquad K := M \cap L^\perp.$$

In both cases, since $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{\log d}$, so that the sufficient condition (43) for GLRT optimality fails to hold.

It turns out that we can demonstrate a matching lower bound for $\epsilon^2_{\text{OPT}}(M)$ in a more direct way by carefully constructing a prior distribution on the alternatives and control the testing error. Doing so allows us to conclude that the GLRT is optimal, and we summarize our conclusions in the following:

Proposition 2. *There are numbers $\{\kappa_\rho, \rho \in (0, 1/2]\}$ such that for the monotone cone M and subspace $L = \{0\}$ or span$(\mathbf{1})$, we have*

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathcal{E}(\psi; L, M, \epsilon) \geq \rho \qquad \text{whenever } \epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \, \sigma^2 \sqrt{\log(ed)}. \tag{46}$$

See Section 4.4 for the proof of this proposition.

Proposition 2, equipped with previous achievable results by GLRT (36), gives a sharp rate characterization on the testing radius for both problems with regard to monotone cone:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_0 : \theta = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta \in M \\ \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_0 : \theta \in \text{span}(\mathbf{1}) \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta \in M. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, the optimal testing radius satisfies $\epsilon^2_{\text{OPT}}(L, M, \rho) \asymp \sigma^2 \sqrt{\log(ed)}$. As a consequence, the GLRT is optimal up to an universal constant. As far as we know, the problem of testing zero or constant vector versus monotone cone has not been fully characterized in the previous literature before.

4 Proofs of main results

We now turn to the proofs of our main results, with the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 given in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively, followed by the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 in Sections 4.3 and 4.4, respectively. In all cases, we defer the proofs of certain more technical lemmas to the appendices.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Since the cones (C_1, C_2) are both invariant under rescaling by positive numbers, we can first prove the result for noise level $\sigma = 1$, and then recapture the general result by rescaling appropriately. Thus, we fix $\sigma = 1$ throughout the remainder of the proof so as to simplify notation. Moreover, let us recall that the GLRT consists of tests of the form $\phi_\beta(y) := \mathbb{I}(T(y) \geq \beta)$, where the likelihood ratio $T(y)$ is given in equation (9a). Note here the cut-off $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ is a constant that does not depend on the data vector y.

By the previously discussed equivalence (22), we can focus our attention on the simpler problem $\mathcal{T}(\{0\}, K; \epsilon)$, where $K = C_2 \cap C_1^*$. By the monotonicity of the square function for positive numbers, the GLRT is controlled by the behavior of the statistic $\|\Pi_K(y)\|_2$, and in particular how it varies depending on whether y is drawn according to $\mathcal{H}_0$ or $\mathcal{H}_1$.

Letting $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote a standard Gaussian random vector, let us introduce the random variable $Z(\theta) := \|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2$ for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Observe that the statistic $\Pi_K(y)\|_2$ is distributed according to $Z(0)$ under the null $\mathcal{H}_0$, and according to $Z(\theta)$ for some $\theta \in K$ under the alternative $\mathcal{H}_1$. The following lemma guarantees random variables of the type $Z(\theta)$ are sharply concentrated around their expectations:

Lemma 2. *For a standard Gaussian random vector $g \sim N(0, I_d)$, closed convex cone $K \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\pm (Z(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[Z(\theta)]) \geq t \Big) \leq \exp\Big(- \frac{t^2}{2} \Big), \qquad \text{and} \tag{47a}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\pm (\langle \theta, \, \Pi_K g \rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \, \Pi_K g \rangle) \geq t \Big) \leq \exp\Big(- \frac{t^2}{2\|\theta\|_2^2} \Big), \tag{47b}$$

where both inequalities hold for all $t \geq 0$.

See Appendix B.1 for the proof of this lemma. For future reference, we also note that tail bound (47a) implies that the variance is bounded as

$$\mathrm{var}(Z(\theta)) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\Big(\big|Z(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[Z(\theta)]\big| \geq \sqrt{u}\Big) du \;\leq\; 2\int_0^\infty e^{-u/2} du \;=\; 4. \tag{48}$$

As shown in the sequel, using the concentration bound (47a), the study of the GLRT can be reduced to the problem of bounding the mean difference

$$\Gamma(\theta) := \mathbb{E}\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2\right) \tag{49}$$

for each $\theta \in K$. In particular, in order to prove the achievability result stated in part (a) of Theorem 1, we need to lower bound $\Gamma(\theta)$ uniformly over $\theta \in K$, whereas a uniform upper bound on $\Gamma(\theta)$ is required in order to prove the negative result in part (b).

4.1.1 Proof of GLRT achievability result (Theorem 1(a))

By assumption, we can restrict our attention to alternative distributions defined by vectors $\theta \in K$ satisfying the lower bound $\|\theta\|_2^2 \geq B_\rho\, \delta^2_{\mathrm{LR}}(\{0\}, K)$, where for every target level $\rho \in (0,1)$, constant B_ρ is chosen such that

$$B_\rho := \max\left\{32\pi,\;\; \inf\left(B > 0 \mid \frac{B^{1/2}}{(2^7\pi B)^{1/4} + 16} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}} \geq \sqrt{-8\log(\rho/2)}\right)\right\}.$$

Since function $f(x) := \frac{x^{1/2}}{(2^7\pi x)^{1/4}+16} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}}$ is strictly increasing and goes to infinity, so that the constant B_ρ defined above is always finite.

We first claim that it suffices to show that for such vector, the difference (49) is lower bounded as

$$\Gamma(\theta) \geq \frac{B_\rho^{1/2}}{(2^7\pi B_\rho)^{1/4} + 16} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}} = f(B_\rho). \tag{50}$$

Taking inequality (50) as given for the moment, we claim that the test

$$\phi_\tau(y) = \mathbb{I}[\|\Pi_K(y)\|_2^2 \geq \tau] \qquad \text{with threshold } \tau := (\tfrac{1}{2} f(B_\rho) + \mathbb{E}[\|\Pi_K(g)\|_2])^2$$

has uniform error probability controlled as

$$\mathcal{E}(\phi_\tau; \{0\}, K, \epsilon) := \mathbb{E}_0[\phi_\tau(y)] + \sup_{\theta \in K, \|\theta\|_2^2 \geq \epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_\theta[1 - \phi_\tau(y)] \;\leq\; 2e^{-f^2(B_\rho)/8} < \rho. \tag{51}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of B_ρ.

Establishing the error control (51)**:** Beginning with errors under the null $\mathcal{H}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_0[\phi_\tau(y)] &= \mathbb{P}_0(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\tau}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_0\big[\|\Pi_K g\|_2 - \mathbb{E}[\|\Pi_K g\|_2] \geq f(B_\rho)/2\big] \\
&\leq \exp(-f^2(B_\rho)/8),
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the concentration bound (47a) in Lemma 2, as along as $f(B_\rho) > 0$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\theta \in K, \|\theta\|_2^2 \geq \epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_\theta[1 - \phi_\tau(y)] &= \mathbb{P}\Big[\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} f(B_\rho) + \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2\Big] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\Big[\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} f(B_\rho) - \Gamma(\theta)\Big],\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by substituting $\Gamma(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2] - \mathbb{E}[\|\Pi_K g\|_2]$. Since the lower bound (50) guarantees that $\frac{1}{2} f(B_\rho) - \Gamma(\theta) \leq -\frac{1}{2} f(B_\rho)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\theta \in K, \|\theta\|_2^2 \geq \epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_\theta[1 - \phi_\tau(y)] &\leq \mathbb{P}\Big[\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} f(B_\rho)\Big] \\ &\leq \exp(-f^2(B_\rho)/8),\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality again uses the concentration inequality (47a). Putting the pieces together yields the claim (51).

Lower bounding the difference $\Gamma(\theta)$: The only remaining detail is to prove the lower bound (50) on the difference (49). In order to do so, we require the following auxiliary lemma:

Lemma 3. *For every closed convex cone K and vector $\theta \in K$, we have the lower bounds*

$$\Gamma(\theta) \geq \frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{2\|\theta\|_2 + 8\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}}. \tag{52a}$$

Moreover, for any vector θ that also satisfies the inequality $\langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \geq \|\theta\|_2^2$, we have

$$\Gamma(\theta) \geq \alpha^2(\theta) \frac{\langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle - \|\theta\|_2^2}{\alpha(\theta)\|\theta\|_2 + 2\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}}, \tag{52b}$$

where $\alpha(\theta) := 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-\langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle^2}{8\|\theta\|_2^2}\right)$.

See Appendix B.2 for the proof of this claim.

We now use Lemma 3 to prove the lower bound (50). Note that the inequality $\|\theta\|_2^2 \geq B_\rho \delta_{\mathrm{LR}}^2(\{0\}, K)$ implies that one of the following two lower bounds must hold:

$$\|\theta\|_2^2 \geq B_\rho \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2, \tag{53a}$$

$$\text{or} \quad \langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \geq \sqrt{B_\rho}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2. \tag{53b}$$

We will analyze these two cases separately.

Case 1: In order to show that the lower bound (53a) implies inequality (50), we will prove a stronger result—namely, that the inequality $\|\theta\|_2^2 \geq \sqrt{B_\rho}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2$ implies that inequality (50) holds.

From the lower bound (52a) and the fact that, for each fixed $a > 0$, the function $x \mapsto x^2/(2x + a)$ is increasing on the interval $[0, \infty)$, we find that

$$\Gamma(\theta) \geq \frac{\sqrt{B_\rho \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}/2}{\sqrt{2}B_\rho^{1/4} + 8\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}}.$$

Further, because of general bound (19) that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ and the fact that the function $x \mapsto x/(a+x)$ is increasing in x, we obtain

$$\Gamma(\theta) \geq \frac{\sqrt{B_\rho}}{2(8\pi B_\rho)^{1/4} + 16} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}},$$

which ensures inequality (50).

Case 2: We now turn to the case when inequality (53b) is satisfied. We may assume the inequality $\|\theta\|_2^2 \geq \sqrt{B_\rho}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2$ is violated because otherwise, inequality (50) follows immediately. When this inequality is violated, we have

$$\langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle \geq \sqrt{B_\rho}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\theta\|_2^2 < \sqrt{B_\rho}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2. \tag{54}$$

Our strategy is to make use of inequality (52b), and we begin by bounding the quantity α appearing therein. By combining inequality (54) and inequality (19)—namely, $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$, we find that

$$\alpha \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{B_\rho}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{4}\right) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{B_\rho}}{4\sqrt{2\pi}}\right) \geq 1/2, \quad \text{whenever } B_\rho \geq 32\pi.$$

Using expression (54), we deduce that

$$\Gamma(\theta) \;\geq\; \frac{\alpha^2\sqrt{B_\rho\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}}{\alpha(4B_\rho)^{1/4} + 4\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{e}} \;\geq\; \frac{\sqrt{B_\rho\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}}{(2^6 B_\rho)^{1/4} + 16\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{e}}.$$

where the second inequality uses the previously obtained lower bound $\alpha > 1/2$, and the fact that the function $x \mapsto x^2/(x+b)$ is increasing in x. This completes the proof of Theorem 1(a).

4.1.2 Proof of GLRT lower bound (Theorem 1(b))

We divide our proof into two cases, depending on whether or not $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2$ is less than 128.

Case 1: When $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 < 128$, we begin by setting $b_\rho = \frac{1}{256}$. The assumed bound $\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{1}{256}\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(\{0\}, K)$ then implies that

$$\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{1}{256}\delta^2_{\text{LR}}(\{0\}, K) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{256} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

For every $\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we claim that $\mathcal{E}(\phi; \{0\}, K, \epsilon) \geq 1/2$. Note that the uniform error $\mathcal{E}(\phi; \{0\}, K, \epsilon)$ is at least as large as the error in the simple binary test

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : y \sim N(0, I_d) \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : y \sim N(\theta, I_d), \tag{55a}$$

where $\theta \in K$ is any vector such that $\|\theta\|_2 = \epsilon$. We claim that the error for the simple binary test (55a) is lower bounded as

$$\inf_\psi \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, \{\theta\}, \epsilon) \geq 1/2 \qquad \text{whenever } \epsilon^2 \leq 1/2. \tag{55b}$$

The proof of this claim is straightforward: introducing the shorthand $\mathbb{P}_\theta = N(\theta, I_d)$ and $\mathbb{P}_0 = N(0, I_d)$, we have

$$\inf_\psi \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, \{\theta\}, \epsilon) = 1 - \|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_0\|_{\text{TV}}.$$

Using the relation between χ^2 distance and TV-distance in expression (78c) and the fact that $\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_\theta, \mathbb{P}_0) = \exp(\epsilon^2) - 1$, (more details can in Section A) we find that the testing error satisfies

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, \{\theta\}, \epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\exp(\epsilon^2) - 1} \geq 1/2, \qquad \text{whenever } \epsilon^2 \leq 1/2.$$

This completes the proof under the condition $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 < 128$.

Case 2: Otherwise, we may assume that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 128$. In this case, our strategy is to exhibit some $\theta \in \mathcal{H}_1$ for which the expected difference $\Gamma(\theta) = \mathbb{E}\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2\right)$ is small, which then leads to significant error when using the GLRT. The following lemma provides suitable control on $\Gamma(\theta)$:

Lemma 4. *For any constant $a \geq 1$ and for every closed convex cone $K \neq \{0\}$, we have*

$$0 \leq \Gamma(\theta) \leq \frac{2a\|\theta\|_2^2 + 4\langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2} + b\|\theta\|_2 \qquad \text{for all } \theta \in K, \tag{56a}$$

where

$$b := 3\exp(-\frac{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}{8}) + 24\exp(-\frac{a^2\|\theta\|_2^2}{16}). \tag{56b}$$

See Appendix C.1 for the proof of this claim.

The following lemma allows us to relate $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$ to its expectation:

Lemma 5. *Given every closed convex cone K such that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 128$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 > \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \; > \; 7/16. \tag{57}$$

See Appendix C.2 for the proof of this claim.

For future reference, we note that it is relatively straightforward to show that the random variable $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$ is distributed as a mixture of χ-distributions, and indeed, the Lemma 5 can be proved via this route. Raubertas et al. [39] proved that the squared quantity $\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2$ is a mixture of χ^2 distributions, and a very similar argument yields the analogous statement for $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$.

We now proceed to prove our main claim. Based on Lemma 4, we claim that if $\epsilon^2 \leq b_\rho \delta^2_{\text{LR}}(\{0\}, K)$ for a suitably small constant b_ρ such that

$$b_\rho := \sup\left\{ b_\rho > 0 \mid 12\sqrt{b_\rho} + 3\sqrt{b_\rho}\left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{1/4} + 24\sqrt{\frac{b_\rho}{2e}} \; \leq \; \frac{1}{16} \right\},$$

then

$$\Gamma(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{16}, \qquad \text{for some } \theta \in K, \; \|\theta\|_2 \geq \epsilon. \tag{58}$$

We take inequality (58) as given for now, returning to prove it later. In summary, then, we have exhibited some $\theta \in \mathcal{H}_1$—namely, $\theta \in K, \; \|\theta\|_2 \geq \epsilon$—such that $\Gamma(\theta) \leq 1/16$, and this special θ plays a central role in our proof.

We are now ready to calculate the testing error for the GLRT given in equation (9b). Our goal is to lower bound the error $\mathcal{E}(\phi_\beta; \{0\}, K, \epsilon)$ uniformly over the chosen threshold $\beta \in [0, \infty)$. We divide the choice of β into three cases, depending on the relationship between β and $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2$, $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2$. Notice this particular θ is chosen to be the one that satisfies inequality (58).

Case 1: First, consider a threshold $\beta \in [0,\ \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2]$. It then follows immediately from inequality (57) that the type I error by its own satisfies

$$\text{type I error} = \mathbb{P}_0(\|\Pi_K y\|_2 \geq \beta) \geq \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \geq \frac{7}{16}.$$

Case 2: Otherwise, consider a threshold $\beta \in \big(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2,\ \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2\big]$. In this case, we again use inequality (57) to bound the type I error, namely

$$\begin{aligned}\text{type I error} = \mathbb{P}_0(\|\Pi_K y\|_2 \geq \beta) &= \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) - \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \in [\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2, \beta)) \\ &\geq \frac{7}{16} - \max_x f_{\|\Pi_K g\|_2}(x)(\beta - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2),\end{aligned}$$

where let $f_{\|\Pi_K g\|_2}$ denotes the density function of random variable $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$ As discussed earlier, the random variable $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$ is distributed as a mixture of χ-distributions; in particular, see Lemma 5 above and the surrounding discussion for details. As can be verified by direct numerical calculation, any χ_k variable has a density that bounded from above by $4/5$. Using this fact, we have

$$\text{type I error} \geq \frac{7}{16} - \frac{4}{5}(\beta - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \overset{(i)}{\geq} \frac{7}{16} - \frac{4}{5}\Gamma(\theta) \overset{(ii)}{>} 3/8,$$

where step (i) follows by the assumption that $\beta \in \big(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2,\ \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2\big]$, and step (ii) follows since $\Gamma(\theta) \leq 1/16$.

Case 3: Otherwise, given a threshold $\beta \in \big(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(g+\theta)\|_2, \infty\big)$, we define the scalar $x := \beta - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(g+\theta)\|_2$. From the concentration inequality given in Lemma 2, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{type II error} \geq \mathbb{P}_\theta(\|\Pi_K y\|_2 \leq \beta) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}\Big(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2 - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2 > \beta - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2\Big) \\ &\geq 1 - \exp(-x^2/2).\end{aligned}$$

At the same time,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{type I error} = \mathbb{P}_0(\|\Pi_K y\|_2 \geq \beta) \ &= \ \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) - \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \in [\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2, \beta)) \\ &\geq \frac{7}{16} - \frac{4}{5}(\beta - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)\end{aligned}$$

where we again use inequality (57) and the boundedness of the density of $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$. Recalling that we define $x := \beta - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K(g+\theta)\|_2$ and $\Gamma(\theta) = \mathbb{E}\big(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2\big)$, we have

$$\beta - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 = x + \Gamma(\theta) \ \leq \ x + \frac{1}{16},$$

where the last step uses the fact that $\Gamma(\theta) \leq 1/16$. Consequently, the type I error is lower bounded as

$$\text{type I error} \geq \frac{7}{16} - \frac{4}{5}(x + 1/16) \ = \ \frac{31}{80} - \frac{4}{5}x.$$

Combining the two types of error, we find that the testing error is lower bounded as

$$\inf_{x>0}\Big\{(\frac{31}{80} - \frac{4}{5}x)^+ + 1 - \exp(-x^2/2)\Big\} = 1 - \exp(-\frac{31^2}{2 \times 64^2}) \geq 0.11.$$

Summarizing our analysis of the above three cases, we have shown that the GLRT cannot succeed with error smaller than 0.11 no matter how the cut-off β is chosen.

Proof of inequality (58)**:** The only remaining detail is the proof of inequality (58). First notice that if the radius satisfies $\epsilon^2 \leq b_\rho \delta^2_{\mathrm{LR}}(\{0\}, K)$, then there exists some $\theta \in \mathcal{H}_1$ with $\|\theta\|_2 = \epsilon$ and satisfies

$$\|\theta\|_2^2 \leq b_\rho \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \text{ and } \langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle \leq \sqrt{b_\rho}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2. \tag{59}$$

Setting $a = 4/\sqrt{b_\rho} \geq 1$ in inequality (56a) yields

$$\Gamma(\theta) \leq \frac{8\|\theta\|_2^2/\sqrt{b_\rho} + 4\langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2} + b\|\theta\|_2, \qquad \text{where } b := 3\exp(-\frac{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}{8}) + 24\exp(-\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{b_\rho}).$$

Now we only need to bound the two terms in the upper bound separately. First, note that inequality (59) yields

$$\frac{8\|\theta\|_2^2/\sqrt{b_\rho} + 4\langle \theta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2} \leq 12\sqrt{b_\rho}. \tag{60}$$

On the other hand, again by applying inequality (59), it is straightforward to verify the following two facts that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta\|_2 \exp(-\frac{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}{8}) &\leq \sqrt{b_\rho \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}\exp(-\frac{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}{8}) \\
&\leq \sqrt{b_\rho}\max_{x\in(0,\infty)} \sqrt{x}\exp(-\frac{x^2}{8}) = \sqrt{b_\rho}\left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{1/4}, \\
\text{and} \quad \|\theta\|_2 \exp(-\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{b_\rho}) &\leq \sup_{x\in(0,\infty)} x\exp(-\frac{x^2}{b_\rho}) = \sqrt{\frac{b_\rho}{2e}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities ensures an upper bound for product $b\|\theta\|_2$ and directly leads to upper bound of quantity $\Gamma(\theta)$, namely

$$\Gamma(\theta) \leq 12\sqrt{b_\rho} + 3\sqrt{b_\rho}\left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{1/4} + 24\sqrt{\frac{b_\rho}{2e}},$$

With the choice of b_ρ, we established inequality (58).

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 2. As in the proof of Theorem 1, we can assume without loss of generality that $\sigma = 1$ since the cones (C_1, C_2) are both invariant under rescaling by positive numbers. Since $0 \in C_1$ and $K := C_2 \cap C_1^* \subseteq C_2$, it suffices to prove a lower bound for the reduced problem of testing

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta = 0, \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \|\theta\|_2 \geq \epsilon,\ \theta \in K.$$

Let $B(1) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|\theta\|_2 < 1\}$ denotes the open Euclidean ball of radius 1, and let $B^c(1) := \mathbb{R}^d \backslash B(1)$ denotes its complement.

We divide our analysis into two cases, depending on whether or not $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2$ is less than 7. In both cases, let us set $\kappa_\rho = 1/14$.

Case 1: Suppose that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 < 7$. In this case,

$$\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \delta^2_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\{0\}, K) \leq \kappa_\rho \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 < 1/2.$$

Similar to our proof of Theorem 1(b), Case 1, by reducing to the simple verses simple testing problem (55a), any test yields testing error no smaller than $1/2$ if $\epsilon^2 < 1/2$. So our lower bound directly holds for the case when $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 < 7$.

Case 2: Otherwise, suppose we have $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 7$. The following lemma provides a generic way to lower bound the testing error.

Lemma 6. *For every non-trivial closed convex cone K and probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ supported on $K \cap B^c(1)$, the testing error is lower bounded as*

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, K, \epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle) - 1}, \tag{61}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'}$ denotes expectation with respect to an i.i.d pair $\eta, \eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}$.

See Appendix D.1 for the proof of this claim.

We apply Lemma 6 with the probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ defined as

$$\mathbb{Q}(A) := \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\Pi_K g}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2} \in A \;\middle|\; \|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2\right), \tag{62}$$

for measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ where g denotes a standard d-dimensional Gaussian random vector i.e., $g \sim N(0, I_d)$. It is easy to check that measure $\mathbb{Q}$ is supported on $K \cap B^c(1)$. The following lemma is central to our proof.

Lemma 7. *Letting η and η' denote an i.i.d pair of random variables drawn from the distribution $\mathbb{Q}$ defined in equation (62), we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle) \leq \frac{1}{a^2} \exp\left(\frac{5\epsilon^2 \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2^2}{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2} + \frac{40\epsilon^4 \mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)}{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^4}\right), \tag{63}$$

where $a := \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ satisfies the inequality $\epsilon^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2/32$.

See Appendix D.2 for the proof of this claim.

We now lower bound the testing error when $\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \, \delta^2_{\text{OPT}}(\{0\}, K)$. By definition of $\delta^2_{\text{OPT}}(\{0\}, K)$, the inequality $\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \, \delta^2_{\text{OPT}}(\{0\}, K)$ implies that

$$\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \qquad \text{and} \quad \epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2}\right)^2.$$

The first inequality above implies, with $\kappa_\rho = 1/14$, that $\epsilon^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/14 \leq (\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2/32$ (note that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 7$). Therefore the assumption in Lemma 7 is satisfied so that inequality (63) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle) \;\leq\; \frac{1}{a^2} \exp\left(5\kappa_\rho + \frac{40\kappa_\rho^2 \mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)}{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}\right). \tag{64}$$

So it suffices to control the right hand side above. From the concentration result in Lemma 2, we obtain

$$a = \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \;\geq\; 1 - \exp(-\frac{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}{8}) > 1 - \exp(-6),$$

where the last step uses $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 7$, and

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 = (\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2 + \text{var}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \leq (\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2 + 4.$$

Here the last inequality follows from the fact that $\text{var}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \leq 4$—see Lemma 2. Plugging these two inequalities into expression (64) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle) \;\leq\; \left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp(-6)}\right)^2 \exp\left(5\kappa_\rho + 40\kappa_\rho^2 + \frac{160\kappa_\rho^2}{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}\right),$$

where the right hand side is less than 2 when $\kappa_\rho = 1/14$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 7$. Combining with inequality (61) forces the testing error to be lower bounded as

$$\forall \psi, \quad \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, K, \epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle) - 1} \geq \frac{1}{2} > \rho,$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 2.

4.3 Proof of Proposition 1

As in the proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we can assume without loss of generality that $\sigma = 1$ since K_+ is invariant under rescaling by positive numbers. We split our proof into two cases, depending on whether or not the dimension d is less than 81.

Case 1: First suppose that $d < 81$. If the separation is upper bounded as $\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \sqrt{d}$, then setting $\kappa_\rho = 1/18$ yields

$$\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \sqrt{d} < 1/2.$$

Similar to our proof for Theorem 1(b) Case 1, if $\epsilon^2 < 1/2$, every test yields testing error no smaller than $1/2$. It is seen by considering a simple verses simple testing problem (55a). So our lower bound directly holds for the case when $d < 81$ satisfies.

Case 2: Let us consider the case when dimension $d \geq 81$. The idea is to make use of our Lemma 6 to show that the testing error is at least ρ whenever $\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \sqrt{d}$. In order to apply Lemma 6, the key is to construct a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ supported on set $K \cap B^c(1)$ such that for i.i.d. pair η, η' drawn from $\mathbb{Q}$, quantity $\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle}$ can be well controlled. We claim that there exists such a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} e^{\lambda \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle} \leq \exp\left(\exp\left(\frac{2+\lambda}{\sqrt{d}-1}\right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)^2\right) \qquad \text{where } \lambda := \epsilon^2. \tag{65}$$

Taking inequality (65) as given for now, letting $\kappa_\rho = 1/8$, we have $\lambda = \epsilon^2 \leq \sqrt{d}/8$. So the right hand side in expression (65) can be further upper bounded as

$$\exp\left(\exp\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{d}-1} + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{d}-1}\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{d}}\right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)^2\right) \leq \exp\left(\exp\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{9}{8} \cdot \frac{1}{8}\right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{9}\right)^2\right) < 2,$$

where we use the fact that $d \geq 81$. As a consequence of Lemma 6, the testing error of every test satisfies

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathcal{E}(\psi; \{0\}, K_+, \epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle) - 1} > \frac{1}{2} \geq \rho.$$

Putting these two cases together, our lower bound holds for any dimension thus we complete the proof of Proposition 1.

So it only remains to construct a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ such that the inequality (65) holds. We begin by introducing some helpful notation. For an integer s to be specified, consider a collection of vectors $\mathcal{S}$ containing all d-dimensional vectors with exactly s non-zero entries and each non-zero entry equals to $1/\sqrt{s}$. Note that there are in total $M := \binom{d}{s}$ vectors of this type. Letting $\mathbb{Q}$ be the uniform distribution over this set of vectors namely

$$\mathbb{Q}(\{\eta\}) := \frac{1}{M}, \qquad \eta \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{66}$$

Then we can write the expectation as

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle} = \frac{1}{M^2}\sum_{\eta,\eta'\in\mathcal{S}} e^{\lambda\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle}.$$

Note that the inner product $\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle$ takes values i/s, for integer $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s\}$ and given every vector η and integer $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s\}$, the number of η' such that $\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle = i/s$ equals to $\binom{s}{i}\binom{d-s}{s-i}$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle} = \binom{d}{s}^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{s}\binom{s}{i}\binom{d-s}{s-i}e^{\lambda i/s} = \sum_{i=0}^{s}\frac{A_i z^i}{i!}, \tag{67}$$

where

$$z := e^{\lambda/s} \text{ and } A_i := \frac{(s!(d-s)!)^2}{((s-i)!)^2 d!(d-2s+i)!}.$$

Let us set integer $s := \lfloor\sqrt{d}\rfloor$. We claim quantity A_i satisfies the following bound

$$A_i \le \exp\Big(-(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}})^2 + \frac{2i}{\sqrt{d}-1}\Big) \qquad \text{for all } i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s\}. \tag{68}$$

Taking expression (68) as given for now and plugging into inequality (67), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle} \le \exp\Big(-(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}})^2\Big)\sum_{i=0}^{s}\frac{(z\exp(\frac{2}{\sqrt{d}-1}))^i}{i!} &\overset{(a)}{\le} \exp\Big(-(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}})^2\Big)\exp\Big(z\exp(\frac{2}{\sqrt{d}-1})\Big)\\ &\overset{(b)}{\le} \exp\left(-\left(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)^2 + \exp\left(\frac{2+\lambda}{\sqrt{d}-1}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where step (a) follows from the standard power series expansion $e^x = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\frac{x^i}{i!}$ and step (b) follows by $z = e^{\lambda/s}$ and $s = \lfloor\sqrt{d}\rfloor > \sqrt{d} - 1$. Therefore it verifies inequality (65) and complete our argument.

It is only left for us to check inequality (68) for A_i. Using the fact that $1 - x \le e^{-x}$, it is guaranteed that

$$A_0 = \frac{((d-s)!)^2}{d!(d-2s)!} = (1-\frac{s}{d})(1-\frac{s}{d-1})\cdots(1-\frac{s}{d-s+1}) \le \exp(-s\sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{1}{d-s+i}). \tag{69a}$$

Recall that integer $s = \lfloor\sqrt{d}\rfloor$, then we can bound the sum in expression (69a) as

$$s\sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{1}{d-s+i} \ge s\sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{1}{d} = \frac{s^2}{d} \ge (1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}})^2,$$

which, when combined with inequality (69a), implies that $A_0 \le \exp(-(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}})^2)$.

Moreover, direct calculations yield

$$\frac{A_i}{A_{i-1}} = \frac{(s-i+1)^2}{d-2s+i}, \qquad 1 \le i \le s. \tag{69b}$$

This ratio is decreasing with index i as $1 \le i \le s$, thus is upper bounded by A_1/A_0, which implies that

$$\frac{A_i}{A_{i-1}} \le \frac{d}{d-2\sqrt{d}+1} = (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}-1})^2 \le \exp(\frac{2}{\sqrt{d}-1}),$$

where the last inequality follows from $1 + x \le e^x$. Putting pieces together validates bound (68) thus finishing the proof of Proposition 1.

4.4 Proof of Proposition 2

As in the proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we can assume without loss of generality that $\sigma = 1$ since L and M are both invariant under rescaling by positive numbers.

We split our proof into two cases, depending on whether or not $\sqrt{\log(ed)} < 14$.

Case 1: First suppose $\sqrt{\log(ed)} < 14$, so that the choice $\kappa_\rho = 1/28$ yields the upper bound

$$\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \sqrt{\log(ed)} < 1/2.$$

Similar to our proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1, by reducing to a simple testing problem (55a), any test yields testing error no smaller than $1/2$ if $\epsilon^2 < 1/2$. Thus, we conclude that the stated lower bound holds when $\sqrt{\log(ed)} < 14$.

Case 2: Otherwise, we may assume that $\sqrt{\log(ed)} \geq 14$. In this case, we exploit Lemma 6 in order to show that the testing error is at least ρ whenever $\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \sqrt{\log(ed)}$. Doing so requires constructing a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}_L$ supported on $M \cap L^\perp \cap B^c(1)$ such that the expectation $\mathbb{E}e^{\epsilon^2 \langle \eta, \eta' \rangle}$ can be well controlled, where (η, η') are drawn i.i.d according to $\mathbb{Q}_L$. Note that L can be either $\{0\}$ or $\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{1})$.

Before doing that, let us first introduce some notation. Let $\delta := 9$ and $r := 1/3$ (note that $\delta = r^{-2}$). Let

$$m := \max \left\{ n \;\Big|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lfloor \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta^i}(d + \log_\delta d + 3) \rfloor \,<\, d \right\}. \tag{70}$$

We claim that the integer m defined above satisfies:

$$\lceil \frac{3}{4} \log_\delta(d) \rceil + 1 \leq m \leq \lceil \log_\delta d \rceil, \tag{71}$$

where $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer that is greater than or equal to x. To see this, notice that for $t = \lceil \frac{3}{4} \log_\delta(d) \rceil + 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \lfloor \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta^i}(d + \log_\delta d + 3) \rfloor \leq \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta^i}(d + \log_\delta d + 3) &= (1 - \frac{1}{\delta^t})(d + \alpha) \\ &\overset{(i)}{\leq} d + \alpha - \frac{d + \alpha}{\delta^2 d^{3/4}} \overset{(ii)}{<} d, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\alpha := \log_\delta d + 3$. The step (i) follows by definition that $t = \lceil \frac{3}{4} \log_\delta(d) \rceil + 1$ while step (ii) holds because as $\sqrt{\log(ed)} \geq 14$, we have $\alpha = \log_\delta d + 3 < d^{1/4}/\delta^2$. On the other hand, for $t = \lceil \log_\delta d \rceil$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \lfloor \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta^i}(d + \log_\delta d + 3) \rfloor &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta^i}(d + \alpha) - t \\ &= (1 - \frac{1}{\delta^t})(d + \alpha) - t \\ &> d + \alpha - \frac{d + \alpha}{d} - (\log_\delta d + 1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses fact $t = \lceil \log_\delta d \rceil$. Since when $\sqrt{\log(ed)} \geq 14$, we have $\alpha = \log_\delta d + 3 < d$, therefore $(d+\alpha)/d + \log_\delta d + 1 \leq 2 + \log_\delta d + 1 = \alpha$, which guarantees that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} \lfloor \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta^i}(d + \log_\delta d + 3) \rfloor > d.$$

We thereby established inequality (71).

We now claim that there exists a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}_L$ supported on $M \cap L^\perp \cap B^c(1)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}_L} e^{\lambda \langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle} \leq \exp\left(\exp\left(\frac{9\lambda/4 + 2}{\sqrt{m} - 1} \right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \right)^2 + \frac{27\lambda}{32(\sqrt{m} - 1)} \right), \qquad \text{where } \lambda := \epsilon^2. \tag{72}$$

Recall that we showed in inequality (71) that $m \geq \lceil \frac{3}{4} \log_\delta(d) \rceil + 1$. Setting $\kappa_\rho = 1/62$ implies that whenever $\epsilon^2 \leq \kappa_\rho \sqrt{\log(ed)}$, we have

$$\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{1}{62}\sqrt{\log(ed)} = \frac{1}{62}\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{3}\log\delta \cdot \frac{3}{4}\log_\delta d} \leq \frac{1}{62}\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\log\delta\left(1 + \frac{3}{4}\log_\delta d\right)} \leq \frac{1}{36}\sqrt{m}. \tag{73}$$

So the right hand side in expression (72) can be made less than 2 by

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\left(\frac{9\lambda/4 + 2}{\sqrt{m} - 1} \right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \right)^2 + \frac{27\lambda}{32(\sqrt{m} - 1)} &\leq \exp\left(\frac{9\lambda}{4\sqrt{m}} \frac{\sqrt{m}}{\sqrt{m} - 1} + \frac{2}{7} \right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{8} \right)^2 + \frac{27\lambda}{32\sqrt{m}} \frac{\sqrt{m}}{\sqrt{m} - 1} \\
&\leq \exp\left(\frac{9}{4 \cdot 36} \frac{8}{7} + \frac{2}{7} \right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{8} \right)^2 + \frac{27}{32 \cdot 36} \frac{8}{7} < \log 2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $\sqrt{m} \geq \sqrt{1 + \frac{3}{4}\log_\delta d} \geq 8$. Lemma 6 thus guarantees the testing error to be no less than

$$\inf_\psi \mathcal{E}(\psi; L, M, \epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'}\, \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle) - 1} > \frac{1}{2} \geq \rho,$$

which leads to our result in Proposition 2.

Now it only remains to construct a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}_L$ with the right support such that inequality (72) holds. To do this, we make use of a fact from the proof of Proposition 1 for the orthant cone $K_+ \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Recall that to establish Proposition 1, we constructed a probability measure $\mathbb{D}$ supported on $K_+ \cap S^{m-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ such that if b, b' are an i.i.d pair drawn from $\mathbb{D}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{b,b' \sim \mathbb{D}} e^{\lambda \langle b,\, b' \rangle} \leq \exp\left(\exp\left(\frac{2 + \lambda}{\sqrt{m} - 1} \right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \right)^2 \right). \tag{74}$$

By construction, $\mathbb{D}$ is a uniform probability measure on the finite set $\mathcal{S}$ which consists of all vectors in $\mathbb{R}^m$ which have s non-zero entries which are all equal to $1/\sqrt{s}$ where $s = \lfloor \sqrt{m} \rfloor$.

Based on this measure $\mathbb{D}$, let us define $\mathbb{Q}_L$ as in the following lemma and establish some of its properties under the assumption that $\sqrt{\log(ed)} \geq 14$.

Lemma 8. *Let G be the $m \times m$ lower triangular matrix given by*

$$G := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ r & 1 & & & \\ r^2 & r & 1 & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \\ r^{m-1} & r^{m-2} & \cdots & & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{75a}$$

There exists an $d \times m$ matrix F such that

$$F^T F \;=\; \mathbb{I}_m \tag{75b}$$

and such that for every $b \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\eta := FGb$, we have

1. *$\eta \in M \cap L^\perp \cap B^c(1)$ if $L = \{0\}$, and*
2. *$\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1} \in M \cap L^\perp \cap B^c(1)$ if $L = span(\mathbf{1})$, where $\bar{\eta} = \sum_{i=1}^d \eta_i/d$ denotes the mean of the vector η.*

See Appendix E.2 for the proof of this claim.

If $L = \{0\}$, let probability measure $\mathbb{Q}_L$ be defined as the distribution of $\eta := FGb$ where $b \sim \mathbb{D}$. Otherwise if $L = \text{span}(\mathbf{1})$, let $\mathbb{Q}_L$ be the distribution of $\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}$ where again $\eta := FGb$ and $b \sim \mathbb{D}$. From Lemma 8 we know that $\mathbb{Q}_L$ is supported on $M \cap L^\perp \cap B^c(1)$. It only remains to verify the critical inequality (72) to complete the proof of Proposition 2. Let $\eta = FGb$ and $\eta' = FGb'$ with b, b' being i.i.d having distribution $\mathbb{D}$. Using the fact that $F^T F = \mathbb{I}_m$, we can write the inner product of η, η' as

$$\langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle = b^T G^T F^T F G b' = \langle Gb,\, Gb' \rangle.$$

The following lemma relates inner product $\langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle$ to $\langle b,\, b' \rangle$, and thereby allows us to derive inequality (72) based on inequality (74). Recall that $\mathcal{S}$ consists of all vectors in $\mathbb{R}^m$ which have s non-zero entries which are all equal to $1/\sqrt{s}$ where $s = \lfloor \sqrt{m} \rfloor$.

Lemma 9. *For every $b, b' \in \mathcal{S}$, we have*

$$\langle Gb,\, Gb' \rangle \;\leq\; \frac{\langle b,\, b' \rangle}{(1-r)^2} + \frac{r}{s(1-r)^2(1-r^2)}, \tag{76a}$$

$$\|Gb\|_2^2 \;\geq\; \frac{1}{(1-r)^2} - \frac{2r + r^2}{s(1-r^2)(1-r)^2}. \tag{76b}$$

See Appendix E.3 for the proof of this claim.

We are now ready to prove inequality (72). We consider the two cases $L = \{0\}$ and $L = \text{span}(\mathbf{1})$ separately.

For $L = \{0\}$, recall that $r = 1/3$ and $s = \lfloor \sqrt{m} \rfloor \geq \sqrt{m} - 1$. Therefore as a direct consequence of inequality (76a), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta, \eta \sim \mathbb{Q}} e^{\lambda \langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle} \leq \mathbb{E}_{b, b' \sim \mathbb{D}} \exp\left(\frac{9\lambda}{4} \langle b,\, b' \rangle + \frac{27\lambda}{32(\sqrt{m} - 1)} \right). \tag{77}$$

Combining inequality (77) with (74) completes the proof of inequality (72).

Let us now turn to the case when $L = \text{span}(\mathbf{1})$. The proof is essentially the same as for $L = \{0\}$ with only some minor changes. Again our goal is to check inequality (72). For this, we write

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta, \eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}_L} e^{\lambda \langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle} = \mathbb{E}_{\eta, \eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}_{\{0\}}} e^{\lambda \langle \eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1},\, \eta' - \bar{\eta'}\mathbf{1} \rangle} \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}_{\eta, \eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}_{\{0\}}} e^{\lambda \langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle}.$$

Here the last step use the fact that $\langle \eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1},\, \eta' - \bar{\eta'}\mathbf{1} \rangle = \langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle - d\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta'} \leq \langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle$ where the last inequality follows from the non-negativity of every entry of vectors η and η' (this non-negativity is a consequence of the non-negativity of F and G from Lemma 8 and non-negativity of vectors in $\mathcal{S}$).

Thus, we have completed the proof of Proposition 2.

5 Discussion

In this paper, we have studied the the problem of testing between two hypotheses that are specified by a pair of non-oblique closed convex cones. Our first main result provided a characterization, sharp up to universal multiplicative constants, of the testing radius achieved by the generalized likelihood ratio test. This characterization was geometric in nature, depending on a combination of the Gaussian width of an induced cone, and a second geometric parameter. Due to the combination of these parameters, our analysis shows that the GLRT can have very different behavior even for cones that have the same Gaussian width; for instance, compare our results for the circular and orthant cone in Section 3.1. It is worth noting that this behavior is in sharp contrast to the situation for estimation problems over convex sets, where it is understood that (localized) Gaussian widths completely determine the estimation error associated with the least-squares estimator [51, 11]. In this way, our analysis reveals a fundamental difference between minimax testing and estimation.

Our analysis also highlights some new settings in which the GLRT is non-optimal. Although past work [52, 33, 37] has exhibited non-optimality of the GLRT in certain settings, in the context of cones, all of these past examples involve oblique cones. In Section 3.1.4, we gave an example of sub-optimality which, to the best of our knowledge, is the first for a non-oblique pair of cones—namely, the cone $\{0\}$, and a certain type of Cartesian product cone.

Our work leaves open various questions, and we conclude by highlighting a few here. First, in Section 3.2, we proved a general information-theoretic lower bound for the minimax testing radius. This lower bound provides a sufficient condition for the GLRT to be minimax optimal up to constants. Despite being tight in many non-trivial situations, our information-theoretic lower bound is not tight for all cones; proving such a sharp lower bound is an interesting topic for future research. Second, as with a long line of past work on this topic [39, 34, 32, 52], our analysis is based on assuming that the noise variance σ^2 is known. In practice, this may or may not be a realistic assumption, and so it is interesting to consider the extension of our results to this setting.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by Office of Naval Research MURI grant DOD-002888, Air Force Office of Scientific Research Grant AFOSR-FA9550-14-1-001, and National Science Foundation Grants CIF-31712-23800 and DMS-1309356.

A Distances and their properties

Here we collect some background on distances between probability measures that are useful in analyzing testing error. Suppose $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_2$ are two probability measures on Euclidean space $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B})$ equipped with Lebesgue measure. For the purpose of this paper, we assume $\mathbb{P}_1 \ll \mathbb{P}_2$. The *total variation* (TV) distance between $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_2$ is defined as

$$\|\mathbb{P}_1 - \mathbb{P}_2\|_{\text{TV}} := \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathbb{P}_1(B) - \mathbb{P}_2(B)| = \frac{1}{2} \int |d\mathbb{P}_1 - d\mathbb{P}_2|. \tag{78a}$$

A closely related measure of distance is the χ^2 *distance* given by

$$\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) := \int (\frac{d\mathbb{P}_1}{d\mathbb{P}_2} - 1)^2 d\mathbb{P}_2. \tag{78b}$$

For future reference, we note that the TV distance and χ^2 distance are related via the inequality

$$\|\mathbb{P}_1 - \mathbb{P}_2\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)}. \tag{78c}$$

B Auxiliary proofs for Theorem 1(a)

In this appendix, we collect the proofs of lemmas involved in the proof of Theorem 1(a).

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Given every vector θ, we claim that the function $g \mapsto \|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2$ is 1-Lipschitz, whereas the function $g \mapsto \langle \theta, \Pi_K g \rangle$ is a $\|\theta\|_2$-Lipschitz function. From these claims, the concentration results then follow from Borell's theorem [9].

In order to establish the Lipschitz property, consider two vectors $g, g' \in \mathbb{R}^d$. By the triangle inequaliuty non-expansiveness of Euclidean projection, we have

$$\Big| \|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 - \|\Pi_K(\theta + g')\|_2 \Big| \leq \|\Pi_K(\theta + g) - \Pi_K(\theta + g')\|_2 \ \leq \ \|g - g'\|_2.$$

Combined with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we conclude that

$$\big| \langle \theta, \, \Pi_K g \rangle - \langle \theta, \, \Pi_K g' \rangle \big| \leq \|\theta\|_2 \, \|\Pi_K g - \Pi_K g'\|_2 \leq \|\theta\|_2 \, \|g - g'\|_2,$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 2.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3

We define the random variable $Z(\theta) := \|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2$, as well as its positive and negative parts $Z^+(\theta) = \max\{0, Z(\theta)\}$ and $Z^-(\theta) = \max\{0, -Z(\theta)\}$, so that $\Gamma(\theta) = \mathbb{E}Z(\theta) = \mathbb{E}Z^+(\theta) - \mathbb{E}Z^-(\theta)$. Our strategy is to bound $\mathbb{E}Z^-(\theta)$ from above and then bound $\mathbb{E}Z^+(\theta)$ from below. The following auxiliary lemma is useful for these purposes:

Lemma 10. *For every closed convex cone $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and vectors $x \in K$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have:*

$$\Big| \|\Pi_K(x + y)\|_2 - \|\Pi_K(y)\|_2 \Big| \leq \|x\|_2, \qquad \text{and} \tag{79}$$

$$\max\big\{2\langle x, \, y\rangle + \|x\|_2^2, \, 2\langle x, \, \Pi_K y\rangle - \|x\|_2^2\big\} \overset{(i)}{\leq} \|\Pi_K(x + y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K(y)\|_2^2 \overset{(ii)}{\leq} 2\langle x, \, \Pi_K y\rangle + \|x\|_2^2. \tag{80}$$

We return to prove this claim in Appendix B.3.

Inequality (79) implies that $Z(\theta) \geq -\|\theta\|_2$ and thus $\mathbb{E}Z^-(\theta) \leq \|\theta\|_2 \mathbb{P}\{Z(\theta) \leq 0\}$. The lower bound in inequality (80) then implies that $\mathbb{P}\{Z(\theta) \leq 0\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\langle \theta, \, g\rangle \leq -\|\theta\|_2^2/2\} \leq \exp\big(-\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{8}\big)$, whence

$$\mathbb{E}Z^-(\theta) \leq \|\theta\|_2 \exp\left(\frac{-\|\theta\|_2^2}{8}\right) \leq \sup_{u > 0}\Big(u e^{-u^2/8}\Big) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}}.$$

Putting together the pieces, we have established the lower bound

$$\mathbb{E}Z(\theta) \;=\; \mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}Z^{-}(\theta) \;\geq\; \mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta) - \frac{2}{\sqrt{e}}. \tag{81}$$

The next task is to lower bound the expectation $\mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta)$. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2 &\leq \|\Pi_K(\theta+g) - \Pi_K(g)\|_2 + \|\Pi_K(g)\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\theta\|_2 + \|\Pi_K(g)\|_2,\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses non-expansiveness of the projection. Consequently, we have the lower bound

$$\mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}\frac{\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)^{+}}{\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2 + \|\Pi_K g\|_2} \geq \mathbb{E}\frac{\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)^{+}}{\|\theta\|_2 + 2\|\Pi_K g\|_2}. \tag{82}$$

Note that inequality (80)(i) implies two lower bounds on the difference $\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2$. We treat each of these lower bounds in turn, and show how they lead to inequalities (52a) and (52b).

Proof of inequality (52a)**:** Inequality (82) and the first lower bound term from inequality (80)(i) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta) \geq \mathbb{E}\frac{\left(2\langle\theta,\, g\rangle + \|\theta\|_2^2\right)^{+}}{\|\theta\|_2 + 2\|\Pi_K g\|_2} \geq \mathbb{E}\frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{\|\theta\|_2 + 2\|\Pi_K g\|_2}\mathbb{I}\{\langle\theta,\, g\rangle \geq 0\}.$$

Jensen's inequality (and the fact that $\mathbb{P}\{\langle\theta,\, g\rangle \geq 0\} = 1/2$) now allow us to deduce

$$\mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta) \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\langle\theta,\, g\rangle \geq 0\right\}\|\theta\|_2^2\left(\|\theta\|_2 + \frac{2\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{P\left\{\langle\theta,\, g\rangle \geq 0\right\}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{2\|\theta\|_2 + 8\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}$$

and this gives inequality (52a).

Proof of inequality (52b)**:** Putting inequality (82), the second term on the left hand side of inequality (80)(i), along with the fact that $\langle\theta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle \geq \|\theta\|_2^2$ together guarantees that

$$\mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta) \geq \mathbb{E}\frac{\left(2\langle\theta,\, \Pi_K g\rangle - \|\theta\|_2^2\right)^{+}}{\|\theta\|_2 + 2\|\Pi_K g\|_2} \geq \mathbb{E}\frac{\langle\theta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle - \|\theta\|_2^2}{\|\theta\|_2 + 2\|\Pi_K g\|_2}\;\mathbb{I}\left\{\langle\theta,\, \Pi_K g\rangle > \frac{1}{2}\langle\theta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle\right\}.$$

Now introducing the event $\mathcal{D} := \left\{\langle\theta,\, \Pi_K g\rangle > \langle\theta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle/2\right\}$, Jensen's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E}Z^{+}(\theta) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D})\,\mathbb{E}\frac{\langle\theta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle - \|\theta\|_2^2}{\|\theta\|_2 + 2\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D})}}. \tag{83}$$

The concentration inequality (47b) from Lemma 2 gives us that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}) \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\langle\theta,\, \Pi_K g\rangle > \frac{1}{2}\langle\theta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle\right\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\langle\theta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle^2}{8\|\theta\|_2^2}\right). \tag{84}$$

Inequality (52b) now follows by combining inequalities (81), (83) and (84).

B.3 Proof of Lemma 10

It remains to prove Lemma 10. Inequality (79) is a standard Lipschitz property of projection onto a closed convex cone. Turning to inequality (80), recall the polar cone $K^* := \{z \mid \langle z, \theta\rangle \leq 0, \ \forall\, \theta \in K\}$, as well as the Moreau decomposition (16)—namely, $z = \Pi_K(z) + \Pi_{K^*}(z)$. Using this notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Pi_K(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K y\|_2^2 &= \|x + y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|y - \Pi_{K^*} y\|_2^2 \\ &= \|x\|_2^2 + 2\langle x,\, y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\rangle + \|y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|y - \Pi_{K^*} y\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Pi_{K^*}(y)$ is the closest point in K^* to y, we have $\|y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\|_2 \geq \|y - \Pi_{K^*}(y)\|_2$, and hence

$$\|\Pi_K(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K y\|_2^2 \geq \|x\|_2^2 + 2\langle x,\, y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\rangle. \tag{85}$$

Since $x \in K$ and $\Pi_{K^*}(x+y) \in K^*$, we have $\langle x,\, \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\rangle \leq 0$, and hence, inequality (85) leads to the bound (i) in equation (80). In order to establish inequality (ii) in equation (80), we begin by rewriting expression (85) as

$$\|\Pi_K(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K y\|_2^2 \geq \|x\|_2^2 + 2\langle x,\, y - \Pi_{K^*} y\rangle + 2\langle x,\, \Pi_{K^*} y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\rangle.$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the final term above and using the 1-Lipschitz property of $z \mapsto \Pi_{K^*} z$, we obtain:

$$\langle x,\, \Pi_{K^*} y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\rangle \geq -\|x\|_2 \|\Pi_{K^*} y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\|_2 \geq -\|x\|_2^2,$$

which establishes the upper bound of inequality (80).

Finally, in order to prove the lower bound in inequality (80), we write

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Pi_K(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K y\|_2^2 &= \|x + y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|x + y - \Pi_{K^*} y - x\|_2^2 \\ &= \|x + y - \Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|x + y - \Pi_{K^*} y\|_2^2 + 2\langle x,\, x + y - \Pi_{K^*} y\rangle - \|x\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since the vector $\Pi_{K^*}(x+y)$ corresponds to the projection of $x+y$ onto K^*, we have $\|x+y-\Pi_{K^*}(x+y)\|_2 \leq \|x + y - \Pi_{K^*} y\|_2$ and thus

$$\|\Pi_K(x+y)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K y\|_2^2 \leq \|x\|_2^2 + 2\langle x,\, \Pi_K y\rangle,$$

which completes the proof of inequality (80).

C Auxiliary proofs for Theorem 1(b)

In this appendix, we collect the proofs of lemmas involved in the proof of Theorem 1(b), corresponding to the lower bound on the GLRT performance.

C.1 Proof of Lemma 4

In order to prove that $\Gamma(\theta) \geq 0$, we first introduce the convenient shorthand notation $v_1 := \Pi_{K^*}(\theta + g)$ and $v_2 := \Pi_{K^*} g$. Recall that K^* denotes the polar cone of K defined in expression (15). With this notation, the the Moreau decomposition (16) then implies that

$$\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 = \|\theta + g - v_1\|_2^2 - \|g - v_2\|_2^2 = \|\theta\|_2^2 + 2\langle \theta,\, g - v_1\rangle + \|g - v_1\|_2^2 - \|g - v_2\|_2^2.$$

The right hand side above is greater than $\|\theta\|_2^2 + 2\langle \theta, g - v_1\rangle$ because $\|g - v_1\|_2^2 \geq \min_{v \in K^*} \|g - v\|_2^2 = \|g - v_2\|_2^2$. From the fact that $\mathbb{E}\langle \theta, g\rangle = 0$ and $\langle \theta, v\rangle \leq 0$ for all $v \in K^*$, we have $\Gamma(\theta) \geq 0$.

Now let us prove the upper bound for expected difference $\Gamma(\theta)$. Using the convenient shorthand notation $Z(\theta) := \|\Pi_K(\theta + g)\|_2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2$, we define the event

$$\mathcal{B} := \{\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2\}, \qquad \text{where } g \sim N(0, I_d).$$

Our proof is then based on the decomposition $\Gamma(\theta) = \mathbb{E}Z(\theta) = \mathbb{E}Z(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}^c) + \mathbb{E}Z(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B})$. In particular, we upper bound each of these two terms separately.

Bounding $\mathbb{E}[Z(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}^c)]$: The analysis of this term is straightforward: inequality (79) from Lemma 10 guarantees that $Z(\theta) \leq \|\theta\|_2$, whence

$$\mathbb{E}Z(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}^c) \leq \|\theta\|_2 \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c). \tag{86}$$

Bounding $\mathbb{E}[Z(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B})]$: Turning to the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}Z(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) &\leq \mathbb{E}Z^+(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\frac{\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)^+}{\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2 + \|\Pi_K g\|_2}\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \mathbb{E}\frac{\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)^+}{\|\Pi_K g\|_2}\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}).\end{aligned}$$

On event $\mathcal{B}$, we can lower bound quantity $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$ with $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2$ thus

$$\mathbb{E}\frac{\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)^+}{\|\Pi_K g\|_2}\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\frac{\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)^+ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B})}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2}}_{:=T_1}. \tag{87}$$

Next we use inequality (80) to bound the numerator of the quantity T_1, namely

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\|\Pi_K(\theta+g)\|_2^2 - \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)^+ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(2\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle + \|\theta\|_2^2\right)^+ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(2\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle + a\|\theta\|_2^2\right)^+ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}),$$

for every constant $a \geq 1$. To further simplify notation, introduce event $\mathcal{C} := \{\theta^T \Pi_K g \geq -a\|\theta\|_2^2/2\}$ and by definition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(2\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle + a\|\theta\|_2^2\right)^+ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) &= \mathbb{E}\left(2\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle + a\|\theta\|_2^2\right)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{C}) \\ &\leq a\|\theta\|_2^2 + 2\mathbb{E}[\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{C})].\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

The right hand side of inequality (88) consists of two terms. The first term $a\|\theta\|_2^2$ is a constant, so that we only need to further bound the second term $2\mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{C})$. We claim that

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{C})] \leq \mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle + \|\theta\|_2 \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 (6\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)} + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)/2). \tag{89}$$

Taking inequality (89) as given for the moment, combining inequalities (87), (88) and (89) yields

$$\mathbb{E}Z^+(\theta)\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}) \leq T_1 \leq \frac{2a\|\theta\|_2^2 + 4\mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2} + \|\theta\|_2(24\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)} + 2\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)). \tag{90}$$

As a summary of the above two parts—namely inequalities (86) and (90), if we assume inequality (89), we have

$$\Gamma(\theta) \leq \frac{2a\|\theta\|_2^2 + 4\mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2} + \|\theta\|_2(24\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)} + 3\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)). \tag{91}$$

Based on expression (91), the last step in proving Lemma 4 is to control the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)$ respectively. Using the fact that $\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle = \langle \theta, (g - \Pi_{K^*} g)\rangle \geq \langle \theta, g\rangle$ and the concentration of $\langle \theta, g\rangle$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c) = \mathbb{P}(\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle < -\frac{a}{2}\|\theta\|_2^2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\langle \theta, g\rangle < -\frac{a}{2}\|\theta\|_2^2) \leq \exp(-\frac{a^2\|\theta\|_2^2}{8}),$$

$$\text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c) = \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 < \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \leq \exp(-\frac{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2}{8}).$$

where the second inequality follows directly from concentration result in Lemma 2 (47a). Substituting the above two inequalities into expression (91) yields Lemma 4.

So it is only left for us to show inequality (89). To see this, first notice that

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C})] = \mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c \cup \mathcal{B}^c). \tag{92}$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and triangle inequality allow us to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c \cup \mathcal{B}^c) &= \langle \theta, -\mathbb{E}[\Pi_K g \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c \cup \mathcal{B}^c)]\rangle \\ &\leq \|\theta\|_2 \|\mathbb{E}[\Pi_K g \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c \cup \mathcal{B}^c)]\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\theta\|_2 \Big\{ \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c)\|_2 + \|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}^c)\|_2 \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Jensen's inequality further guarantees that

$$-\mathbb{E}\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c \cup \mathcal{B}^c) \leq \|\theta\|_2 \Big\{ \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c)]}_{:=T_2} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{B}^c)]}_{:=T_3} \Big\}, \tag{93}$$

By definition, on event $\mathcal{B}^c$, we have $\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2/2$, and consequently

$$T_3 \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)}{2}. \tag{94}$$

Turning to the quantity T_2, applying Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yields

$$T_2 \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c)} = \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2 + \text{var}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2)} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)}.$$

The variance term can be bounded as in inequality (48) which says that $\text{var}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \leq 4$.

From inequality (19), for every non-trivial cone ($K \neq \{0\}$), we are guaranteed that $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$, and hence $\text{var}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2) \leq 8\pi(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2$. Consequently, the quantity T_2 can be further bounded as

$$T_2 \leq \sqrt{1 + 8\pi}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)} \leq 6\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)}. \tag{95}$$

Putting together inequalities (94), (95) and (93) yields

$$-\mathbb{E}[\langle \theta, \Pi_K g\rangle \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{C}^c \cup (\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}^c))] \leq \|\theta\|_2 \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 (6\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)} + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)/2),$$

which validates claim (89) when combined with inequality (92). We finish the proof of Lemma 4.

C.2 Proof of Lemma 5

In order to prove this result, we first define random variable $F := \|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 - m$, where $m := \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2$ and $\tilde{\sigma}^2 := \mathrm{var}(F)$. We make use of the Theorem 2.1 in Goldstein et al. [19] which shows that the distribution of F and Gaussian distribution $Z \sim N(0, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$ are very close, more specifically, the Theorem says

$$\|F - Z\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \frac{16}{\tilde{\sigma}^2}\sqrt{m} \leq \frac{8}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2}. \tag{96}$$

In the last inequality, we use the facts that $\tilde{\sigma}^2 \geq 2m$ and $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2} \geq \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2$.

It is known that the quantity $\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2$ is distributed as a mixture of χ^2 distributions(see e.g., [39, 19])—in particular, we can write

$$\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 \stackrel{\mathrm{law}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{V_K} X_i = W_K + V_K, \qquad W_K = \sum_{i=1}^{V_K}(X_i - 1),$$

where each $\{X_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is an i.i.d. sequence χ_1^2 variables, independent of V_K. Applying the decomposition of variance yields

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \mathrm{var}(V_K) + 2\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 \geq 2m.$$

We can write the probability $\mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 > \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)$ as

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2 > \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2) = \mathbb{P}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2 > (\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2) \geq \mathbb{P}(F > 0).$$

So if $\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \geq 128$, then inequality (96) ensures that $d_{TV}(F, N) \leq 1/16$, and hence

$$\mathbb{P}(F > 0) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z > 0) - \|F - Z\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \geq \frac{7}{16}.$$

We finish the proof of Lemma 5.

D Auxiliary proofs for Theorem 2

In this appendix, we collect the proofs of various lemmas used in the proof of Theorem 2.

D.1 Proof of Lemma 6

For every probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ supported on $K \cap B^c(1)$, let vector θ be distributed accordingly to measure $\epsilon\mathbb{Q}$ then it is supported on $K \cap B^c(\epsilon)$. Consider a mixture of distributions,

$$\mathbb{P}_1(y) = \mathbb{E}_\theta \ (2\pi)^{-d/2} \exp(-\frac{\|y-\theta\|_2^2}{2}). \tag{97}$$

Let us first control the χ^2 distance between distributions $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_0 := N(0, I_d)$. Direct calculations yield

$$\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) + 1 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_0}\left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_1}{\mathbb{P}_0}\right)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_0}\left(\mathbb{E}_\theta \exp\{-\frac{\|y-\theta\|_2^2}{2} + \frac{\|y\|_2^2}{2}\}\right)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_0}\left(\mathbb{E}_\theta \exp\{\langle y, \theta\rangle - \frac{\|\theta\|_2^2}{2}\}\right)^2.$$

Suppose random vector θ' is an independent copy of random vector θ, then

$$\begin{aligned}\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) + 1 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_0}\mathbb{E}_{\theta,\theta'} \exp\{\langle y,\, \theta + \theta'\rangle - \frac{\|\theta\|_2^2 + \|\theta'\|_2^2}{2}\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta,\theta'} \exp\{\frac{\|\theta + \theta'\|_2^2}{2} - \frac{\|\theta\|_2^2 + \|\theta'\|_2^2}{2}\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta,\theta'} \exp(\langle \theta,\, \theta'\rangle) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle), \end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

where the second step uses the fact the moment generating function of multivariate normal distribution. As we know, the testing error is always bounded below by $1 - \|\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0\|_{\text{TV}}$, so by the relation between the χ^2 distance and TV distance, we have:

$$\text{testing error } \geq\ 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \exp\left(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle\right) - 1},$$

which completes our proof.

D.2 Proof of Lemma 7

This proof uses Borell's lemma [9] which states that for a standard Gaussian vector $Z \sim N(0, I_d)$ and a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ which is L-Lipschitz, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(af(Z)) \leq \exp(a\mathbb{E}f(Z) + a^2L^2/2) \tag{99}$$

for every $a \geq 0$.

Let g, g' be i.i.d standard normal vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let

$$\mathcal{A}(g) := \{\|\Pi_K g\|_2 > \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2\} \text{ and } \mathcal{A}(g') := \{\|\Pi_K g'\|_2 > \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g'\|_2\}$$

By definition of the probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ in expression (62), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle) &= \mathbb{E}_{g,g'}\left[\exp\left(\frac{4\epsilon^2 \langle \Pi_K g,\, \Pi_K g'\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g'\|_2}\right) \,\Big|\, \mathcal{A}(g) \cap \mathcal{A}(g')\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(g) \cap \mathcal{A}(g'))}\mathbb{E}_{g,g'} \exp\left(\frac{4\epsilon^2 \langle \Pi_K g,\, \Pi_K g'\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g'\|_2}\right) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{A}(g) \cap \mathcal{A}(g')).\end{aligned}$$

Using the independence of g, g' and non-negativity of the exponential function, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2 \langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle) \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(g))^2} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{g,g'} \exp\left(\frac{4\epsilon^2 \langle \Pi_K g,\, \Pi_K g'\rangle}{\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2 \mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g'\|_2}\right)}_{:=T_1}. \tag{100}$$

To simplify the notation, we write $\lambda := 4\epsilon^2/(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2$ so that

$$T_1 = \mathbb{E}_{g,g'} \exp\left(\lambda \langle \Pi_K g,\, \Pi_K g'\rangle\right). \tag{101}$$

Now for every fixed value of g, the function $h \mapsto \langle \Pi_K g,\, \Pi_K h\rangle$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant equal to $\|\Pi_K g\|_2$. This is because

$$|\langle \Pi_K g,\, \Pi_K h\rangle - \langle \Pi_K g,\, \Pi_K h'\rangle| \leq \|\Pi_K g\|_2 \|\Pi_K h - \Pi_K h'\|_2 \leq \|\Pi_K g\|_2 \|h - h'\|_2,$$

where we used Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the non-expansive property of convex projection. As a consequence of inequality (99) and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the term T_1 can be upper bounded as

$$T_1 \leq \mathbb{E}_g \exp\left(\lambda\langle \Pi_K g,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g'\rangle + \frac{\lambda^2\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2}{2}\right) \leq \underbrace{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_g \exp\left(2\lambda\langle \Pi_K g,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g'\rangle\right)}}_{:=T_2}\, \underbrace{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_g \exp\left(\lambda^2\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2\right)}}_{:=T_3}. \quad (102)$$

We now control T_2, T_3 separately. For T_2, note again that $h \mapsto \langle \Pi_K h,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g'\rangle$ is a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant equal to $\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g'\|_2$. Inequality (99) implies therefore that

$$T_2 \leq \sqrt{\exp\left(2\lambda\langle \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g'\rangle + 2\lambda^2\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g'\|_2^2\right)}. \quad (103)$$

To control quantity T_3, we use a result from [1, Sublemma E.3] on the moment generating function of $\|\Pi_K g\|^2$ which gives

$$T_3 \leq \sqrt{\exp\left(\lambda^2\mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2) + \frac{2\lambda^4\mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)}{1-4\lambda^2}\right)}, \qquad \text{whenever } \lambda < 1/4. \quad (104)$$

Because of the assumption that $\epsilon^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^2/32$, we have $\lambda \leq 1/8 < 1/4$. Therefore putting all the pieces together as above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp(\epsilon^2\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle) &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(g))^2} \exp\left((\lambda+\lambda^2)\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2^2 + \frac{\lambda^2\mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)}{2} + \frac{\lambda^4\mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)}{1-4\lambda^2}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(g))^2} \exp\left(1.25\lambda\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2^2 + 2.5\lambda^2\mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(g))^2} \exp\left(\frac{5\epsilon^2\|\mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\|_2^2}{(\mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)} + \frac{40\epsilon^4\mathbb{E}(\|\Pi_K g\|_2^2)}{(\mathbb{E}\|\Pi_K g\|_2)^4})\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of inequality (63).

E Auxiliary proofs for Proposition 2 and the monotone cone

In this appendix, we collect various results related to the monotone cone, and the proof of Proposition 2.

E.1 Proof of Lemma 1

So as to simplify notation, we define $\xi = \Pi_K g$, with j^{th} coordinate denoted as ξ_j. Moreover, for a given vector $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and integers $1 \leq u < v \leq d$, we define the u to v average as

$$\bar{g}_{uv} := \frac{1}{v-u+1}\sum_{j=u}^{v} g_j.$$

To demonstrate an upper bound for the inner product $\inf_{\eta\in K\cap S^{d-1}}\langle \eta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle$, it turns out that it is enough to take $\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-1,1,0,\ldots,0) \in K \cap S^{d-1}$ and uses the fact that

$$\inf_{\eta\in K\cap S^{d-1}}\langle \eta,\, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g\rangle \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathbb{E}(\xi_2 - \xi_1). \quad (105)$$

So it is only left for us to analyze $\mathbb{E}(\xi_2 - \xi_1)$ which actually has an explicit form based on the explicit representation of projection to the monotone cone (see Robertson et al. [43], Chapter 1) where

$$\xi_i = \lambda_i - \bar{\lambda}, \qquad \lambda_i = \max_{u \le j} \min_{v \ge j} \bar{g}_{uv}. \tag{106}$$

This is true because projecting to cone $K = M \cap L^{\perp}$ can be written into two steps $\Pi_K g = \Pi_{L^{\perp}}(\Pi_M g)$ and projecting to subspace $L^{\perp}$ only shifts the vector to be mean zero.

We claim that the difference satisfies

$$\xi_2 - \xi_1 \le \max_{v \ge 2} |\bar{g}_{2v}| + \max_{v \ge 1} |\bar{g}_{1v}|. \tag{107}$$

To see this, as a consequence of expression (106), we have

$$\xi_2 - \xi_1 = \max\{\min_{v \ge 2} \bar{g}_{1v},\ \min_{v \ge 2} \bar{g}_{2v}\} - \min_{v \ge 1} \bar{g}_{1v}.$$

The right hand side above only takes value in set $\{\min_{v \ge 2} \bar{g}_{1v} - g_1,\ 0,\ \min_{v \ge 2} \bar{g}_{2v} - \min_{v \ge 1} \bar{g}_{1v}\}$ where the last two values agree with bound (107) obviously while the first value can be written as

$$\min_{v \ge 2} \bar{g}_{1v} - g_1 = \min_{v \ge 2} \left(\frac{1}{v} \sum_{i=2}^{v} g_i - (1 - \frac{1}{v}) g_1 \right) = \min_{v \ge 2} (1 - \frac{1}{v})(\bar{g}_{2v} - g_1) \le |\bar{g}_{2v}| + |g_1|,$$

which also agrees with inequality (107).

Next let us prove that for every $j = 1, 2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{v \ge j} |\bar{g}_{jv}| < 20\sqrt{2}, \tag{108}$$

and combine this fact with expressions (107) and (105) gives us $\inf_{\eta \in K \cap S^{d-1}} \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}\Pi_K g \rangle \le 40$ which validates the conclusion in Lemma 1.

It is only left for us to verify inequality (108). First as we can partition the interval $[j, d]$ into k smaller intervals where each smaller interval is of length 2^m except the last one, then

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{j \le v \le d} |\bar{g}_{jv}| = \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \le m \le k} \max_{v \in I_m} |\bar{g}_{jv}| \le \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} \max_{v \in I_k} |\bar{g}_{jv}|, \tag{109}$$

where $I_m = [2^m + j - 2, 2^{m+1} + j - 3],\ 1 \le m < k$, the number of intervals k and length of I_k are chosen to make those intervals sum up to d.

Given index $2^m + j - 2 \le v \le 2^{m+1} + j - 3$, random variables $\bar{g}_{jv}$ are Gaussian distributed with mean zero and variance $1/(v - j + 1)$. Suppose we have Gaussian random variable X_v with mean zero and variance $\sigma_m^2 = 1/(2^m - 1)$ and the covariance satisfies $\mathrm{cov}(X_v, X_{v'}) = \mathrm{cov}(\bar{g}_{jv}, \bar{g}_{jv'})$. Since $\sigma_m^2 \ge 1/(v - j + 1)$, the variable $\max_{v \in I_m} |\bar{g}_{jv}|$ is stochastically dominated by the maximum $\max_{2^m \le v \le 2^{m+1} - 1} |X_v|$, and therefore

$$\sum_{m=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} \max_{v \in I_m} |\bar{g}_{jv}| \le \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} \max_{2^m \le v \le 2^{m+1} - 1} |X_v|.$$

Applying the fact that for $t \ge 2$ number of Gaussian random variable $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, we have $\mathbb{E} \max_{1 \le i \le t} |\epsilon_i| \le 4\sigma\sqrt{2 \log t}$ which gives

$$\sum_{m=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} \max_{v \in I_m} |\bar{g}_{jv}| \le \sum_{m=1}^{k} 4\sigma_m \sqrt{2 \log(2^m)} = 4\sqrt{2 \log 2} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{k} \sqrt{\frac{m}{2^m - 1}} \right). \tag{110}$$

The last step is to control the sum $\sum_{m=1}^{k}\sqrt{\frac{m}{2^m-1}}$. There are many ways to show that it is upper bounded by some constant. One crude way is use the fact that $\frac{\sqrt{m}}{2^m-1} \le 2^{m/4}$ whenever $m \ge 5$, therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m=1}^{k}\sqrt{\frac{m}{2^m-1}} = \sum_{m=1}^{4}\sqrt{\frac{m}{2^m-1}} + \sum_{m=5}^{k}\sqrt{\frac{m}{2^m-1}} &< \sum_{m=1}^{4}\sqrt{\frac{m}{2^m-1}} + \sum_{m=5}^{k}\frac{1}{2^{m/4}} \\ &< \sum_{m=1}^{4}\sqrt{\frac{m}{2^m-1}} + \frac{2^{-5/4}}{1-2^{-1/4}} < 6,\end{aligned}$$

which validates inequality (108) when combined with inequalities (109) and (110). This completes the proof of Lemma 1.

E.2 Proof of Lemma 8

The proof of Lemma 8 involves two parts. First, we define the matrices G, F. Then we prove that the distribution of η has the right support where we make use of Lemma 9.

As stated, matrix G is a lower triangular matrix satisfying (75a). Let us now specify the matrix F. Recall that we denote $\delta := r^{-2}$ and $r := 1/3$. To define matrix F, let us first define a partition of $[d]$ into m consecutive intervals $\{I_1, \ldots, I_m\}$ with m specified in expression (70) and the length of each interval $|I_i| = \ell_i$ where ℓ_i is defined as

$$\ell_i := \lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{\delta^i}(d + \log_\delta d + 3)\rfloor, \qquad 1 \le i \le m-1, \tag{111}$$

and $\ell_m := d - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1}\ell_i$.

Following directly from the definition (111), each length $\ell_i \ge 1$ and ℓ_i is a decreasing sequence with regard to i. Also ℓ_i satisfies the following

$$\ell_1 = \lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{\delta}(d + \log_\delta d + 3)\rfloor < d \qquad \text{and} \quad \ell_i \ge \delta\ell_{i+1}, \text{ for } 1 \le i \le m-1, \tag{112}$$

where the first inequality holds since as $\sqrt{\log(ed)} \ge 14$, we have $(\delta-1)(\log_\delta d+3) \le d$ and the last inequality follows from the fact that $\lfloor ab\rfloor \ge a\lfloor b\rfloor$ for positive integer a and $b \ge 0$ (because $a\lfloor b\rfloor$ is an integer that is smaller than ab).

We are now ready to define the $d \times m$ matrix F. We take

$$F(i,j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_j}} & i \in I_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{113}$$

It is easy to check that matrix F satisfies $F^TF = \mathbb{I}_m$ which validates inequality (75b).

First we show that both $\eta = FGb$ and $\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}$ belong to M. The i-th coordinate of η can be written as

$$\eta_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_j}}\sum_{t=1}^{j} r^{j-t}b_t, \qquad \forall\ i \in I_j.$$

Therefore we can denote u_j as the value of η_i for $i \in I_j$. To establish monotonicity, we only need to compare the value in the consecutive blocks. Direct calculation of the consecutive ratio yields

$$\frac{u_{j+1}}{u_j} = \frac{r(\sum_{t=1}^{j} r^{j-t}b_t) + b_{j+1}}{\sqrt{\ell_{j+1}}}\frac{\sqrt{\ell_j}}{\sum_{t=1}^{j} r^{j-t}b_t} \ge r\sqrt{\frac{\ell_j}{\ell_{j+1}}} \ge 1,$$

where we used the non-negativity of coordinates of vector b and the last inequality follows from inequality (112) and $\delta = r^{-2}$. The monotonicity of $\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}$ thus inherits directly from the monotonicity of η.

To complete the proof of Lemma 8, we only need to prove lower bounds on $\|\eta\|_2$ and $\|\eta - \bar{\eta}\|_2$. For these, we shall use inequality (76b) of Lemma 9.

Proof of the bound $\|\eta\|_2 \geq 1$: Recall that $r = 1/3$ and as a direct consequence of inequality (76b) in Lemma 9, we have

$$\langle \eta, \eta \rangle = \|Gb\|_2^2 \;\geq\; \frac{9}{4} - \frac{63}{32s} > 1.96, \tag{114}$$

where the last step follows form the fact that $s = \lfloor \sqrt{m} \rfloor \geq 7$. Therefore, the norm condition holds so η is supported on $M \cap L^T \cap B^c(1)$.

Proof of the bound $\|\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}\|_2 \geq 1$: The norm $\|\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}\|_2^2$ has the following decomposition where

$$\|\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}\|_2^2 = \|\eta\|_2^2 - d(\bar{\eta})^2.$$

We claim that $d(\bar{\eta})^2 \leq 0.2$. If we take this for now, combining with inequality (114) which says $\|\eta\|_2^2$ is greater than 1.96, we can deduce that $\|\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}\|_2^2 \geq 1$. So it suffices to verify the claim $d(\bar{\eta})^2 \leq 0.2$. Recall that $\eta = FGb$. Direct calculation yields

$$d\bar{\eta} = \langle \mathbf{1}, \eta \rangle = \mathbf{1}^T \cdot FGb = \sum_{k=1}^{m} b_k \underbrace{\sum_{i=k}^{m} \sqrt{\ell_i} r^{i-k}}_{:=a_k}.$$

Plugging into the definitions of r and ℓ_i guarantees that

$$a_k \leq \sum_{i=k}^{m} \sqrt{\frac{(\delta-1)(d+\log_\delta d+3)}{\delta^i}} \frac{1}{\delta^{(i-k)/2}} = \sqrt{(\delta-1)(d+\log_\delta d+3)\delta^k} \sum_{i=k}^{m} \delta^{-i} \leq \sqrt{\frac{(d+\log_\delta d+3)}{(\delta-1)\delta^{k-2}}},$$

where the last step uses the summability of a geometric sequence—namely $\sum_{i=k}^{m} \delta^{-i} \leq \delta^{-k+1}/(\delta-1)$. Now for every vector b, our goal is to control $\sum a_k b_k$. Recall that every vector b has s non-zero entries which equal to $1/\sqrt{s}$ where $s = \lfloor \sqrt{m} \rfloor$. Since a_k decreases with k, this inner product $\sum a_k b_k$ is largest when the first s coordinates of b are non-zero, therefore

$$d\bar{\eta} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{s} a_k \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta^2(d+\log_\delta d+3)}{\delta-1}} \sum_{k=1}^{s} \frac{1}{\delta^{k/2}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta^2(d+\log_\delta d+3)}{\delta-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}-1},$$

and thus we have

$$d(\bar{\eta})^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}-1} \frac{(d+\log_\delta d+3)}{d} \frac{\delta^2}{(\delta-1)(\sqrt{\delta}-1)^2} \leq \frac{81(d+\log_\delta d+3)}{32d(\sqrt{m}-1)} < 0.2,$$

where the last step uses $\sqrt{m} \geq 8$. Therefore, the norm condition also holds so $\eta - \bar{\eta}\mathbf{1}$ is supported on $M \cap L^T \cap B^c(1)$.

Thus, we have completed the proof of Lemma 8.

E.3 Proof of Lemma 9

By definition of the matrix G, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Gb,\, Gb'\rangle = \sum_{t=1}^{m}(Gb)_t(Gb')_t &= \sum_{t=1}^{m}(b_t + rb_{t-1} + \cdots + r^{t-1}b_1)(b'_t + rb'_{t-1} + \cdots + r^{t-1}b'_1)\\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{m}\sum_{u=1}^{t}\sum_{v=1}^{t} r^{2t-u-v}b_u b'_v.\end{aligned}$$

Switching the order of summation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Gb,\, Gb'\rangle &= \sum_{u=1}^{m}\sum_{v=1}^{m} b_u b'_v \sum_{t=\max\{u,v\}}^{m} r^{2t-u-v}\\ &= \sum_{u=1}^{m}\sum_{v=1}^{m}\frac{b_u b'_v}{r^{u+v}}\frac{r^{2\max\{u,v\}} - r^{2m+2}}{1-r^2}\\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{1-r^2}\sum_{u=1}^{m}\sum_{v=1}^{m} b_u b'_v r^{|u-v|}}_{:=\Delta_1} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{1-r^2}\sum_{u=1}^{m}\sum_{v=1}^{m} b_u b'_v r^{2m+2-u-v}}_{:=\Delta_2}.\end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

We bound the two terms Δ_1 and Δ_2 separately.

Recall the fact that b, b' belong to $\mathcal{S}$, so there are exactly $s = \lfloor\sqrt{m}\rfloor$ non-zero entry in both b and b' and these entries equal to $1/\sqrt{s}$. The summation defining Δ_1 is not affected by the permutation of coordinates, so that we can assume without loss of generality that the indices of non-zero entries in b are indexed by $\{1,\ldots,s\}$, and that the indices of non-zero entries in b' are indexed by $\{k, k+1, \ldots, k+s-1\}$ for some $1 \le k \le m+1-s$.

We split our proof into two cases depending on whether $k \le s$ or $k > s$.

Case 1 ($k \le s$): The summation Δ_1 can be written as

$$s(1-r^2)\Delta_1 = s\sum_{u=1}^{m}\sum_{v=1}^{m} b_u b'_v r^{|u-v|} = \sum_{u=1}^{s}\sum_{v=k}^{k+s-1} r^{|u-v|}.$$

Direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}s(1-r^2)\Delta_1 &= \sum_{u=1}^{k-1}\sum_{v=k}^{k+s-1} r^{v-u} + \sum_{u=k}^{s}\sum_{v=k}^{u} r^{u-v} + \sum_{u=k}^{s}\sum_{v=u+1}^{k+s-1} r^{v-u}\\ &= \frac{(1-r^s)(r-r^k)}{(1-r)^2} + \frac{s-k+1}{1-r} - \frac{r}{(1-r)^2}(1-r^{s-k+1}) + \frac{r(s-k+1)}{1-r} - \frac{r^k - r^{s+1}}{(1-r)^2}\\ &= \frac{1+r}{1-r}(s-k+1) + \frac{r^k(r^s + r^{s+2} - 2)}{(1-r)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Notice the following two facts that

$$\langle b,\, b'\rangle = \frac{s-k+1}{s} \qquad \text{and} \quad \frac{-2r}{(1-r)^2} \le \frac{r^k(r^s + r^{s+2} - 2)}{(1-r)^2} < 0,$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{(1-r)^2}\langle b,\, b'\rangle + \frac{-2r}{s(1-r^2)(1-r)^2} \le \Delta_1 \le \frac{1}{(1-r)^2}\langle b,\, b'\rangle. \tag{116}$$

Case 2 ($k > s$): The summation Δ_1 satisfies the bounds

$$s(1-r^2)\Delta_1 = s\sum_{u=1}^{m}\sum_{v=1}^{m} b_u b'_v r^{|u-v|} = \sum_{u=1}^{s}\sum_{v=k}^{k+s-1} r^{v-u} = \frac{r^{k-s}(1-r^s)^2}{(1-r)^2}.$$

Since $k - s \geq 1$, we have $\langle b,\, b'\rangle = 0$ and consequently

$$\Delta_1 \leq \frac{1}{(1-r)^2}\langle b,\, b'\rangle + \frac{r}{s(1-r^2)(1-r)^2}. \tag{117}$$

Combining inequalities (115), (116) and (117), we can deduce that

$$\langle Gb,\, Gb'\rangle \;\leq\; \Delta_1 \;\leq\; \frac{1}{(1-r)^2}\langle b,\, b'\rangle + \frac{r}{s(1-r^2)(1-r)^2},$$

which validates inequality (76a).

On the other hand, when $b = b'$, the summation Δ_2 is the largest when the non-zero entries of b lie on coordinates $m - s + 1, \ldots, m$. Thus we have

$$s(1-r^2)\Delta_2 \leq \sum_{u=m-s+1}^{m}\sum_{v=m-s+1}^{m} r^{2m+2-u-v} = \frac{r^2(1-r^s)^2}{(1-r)^2} < \frac{r^2}{(1-r)^2}. \tag{118}$$

Combining decomposition (115) with the inequalities (116), we can deduce that

$$\langle Gb,\, Gb\rangle \leq \frac{1}{(1-r)^2} - \frac{2r}{s(1-r^2)(1-r)^2} - \frac{r^2}{s(1-r^2)(1-r)^2},$$

where we use the fact that $\langle b,\, b\rangle = 1$. This completes the proof of inequality (76b).

References

[1] D. Amelunxen, M. Lotz, M. B. McCoy, and J. A. Tropp. Living on the edge: phase transitions in convex programs with random data. *Information and Inference*, 3(3):224–294, 2014.

[2] Y. Baraud. Non-asymptotic minimax rates of testing in signal detection. *Bernoulli*, 8(5):577–606, 2002.

[3] R. E. Barlow, D. J. Bartholomew, J. Bremner, and H. D. Brunk. *Statistical inference under order restrictions: The theory and application of isotonic regression.* Wiley New York, 1972.

[4] D. Bartholomew. A test of homogeneity for ordered alternatives. *Biometrika*, 46(1/2):36–48, 1959.

[5] D. Bartholomew. A test of homogeneity for ordered alternatives. ii. *Biometrika*, 46(3/4):328–335, 1959.

[6] P. L. Bartlett, O. Bousquet, S. Mendelson, et al. Local Rademacher complexities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 33(4):1497–1537, 2005.

[7] T. Batu, R. Kumar, and R. Rubinfeld. Sublinear algorithms for testing monotone and unimodal distributions. In *Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 381–390. ACM, 2004.

[8] O. Besson. Adaptive detection of a signal whose signature belongs to a cone. In *Proceedings SAM Conference*, 2006.

[9] C. Borell. The Brunn-Minkowski inequality in Gauss space. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 30:207–216, 1975.

[10] P. Bühlmann. Statistical significance in high-dimensional linear models. *Bernoulli*, 19(4):1212–1242, 2013.

[11] S. Chatterjee et al. A new perspective on least squares under convex constraint. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(6):2340–2381, 2014.

[12] D. Chen and R. J. Plemmons. Nonnegativity constraints in numerical analysis. *The birth of numerical analysis*, 10:109–140, 2009.

[13] D. Chetverikov. Testing regression monotonicity in econometric models. Technical report, UCLA, December 2012. arXiv:1212.6757.

[14] R. L. Dykstra and T. Robertson. On testing monotone tendencies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 78(382):342–350, 1983.

[15] A. W. F. Edwards. *Likelihood*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972.

[16] M. S. Ermakov. Minimax detection of a signal in a gaussian white noise. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 35(4):667–679, 1991.

[17] J. Fan and J. Jiang. Nonparametric inference with generalized likelihood ratio tests. *Test*, 16(3):409–444, 2007.

[18] J. Fan, C. Zhang, and J. Zhang. Generalized likelihood ratio statistics and Wilk's phenomenon. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 153–193, 2001.

[19] L. Goldstein, I. Nourdin, and G. Peccati. Gaussian phase transitions and conic intrinsic volumes: Steining the Steiner formula. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.6265*, 2014.

[20] M. Greco, F. Gini, and A. Farina. Radar detection and classification of jamming signals belonging to a cone class. *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, 56(5):1984–1993, May 2008.

[21] X. Hu and F. T. Wright. Likelihood ratio tests for a class of non-oblique hypotheses. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 46(1):137–145, 1994.

[22] Y. I. Ingster. Minimax testing of nonparametric hypotheses on a distribution density in the L_p-metrics. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 31(2):333–337, 1987.

[23] Y. I. Ingster and I. A. Suslina. *Nonparametric goodness-of-fit testing under Gaussian models*, volume 169. Springer Science and Business Media, 2012.

[24] V. Koltchinskii. Rademacher penalties and structural risk minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(5):1902–1914, 2001.

[25] A. Kudo. A multivariate analogue of the one-sided test. *Biometrika*, 50(3/4):403–418, 1963.

[26] E. L. Lehmann. On likelihood ratio tests. In *Selected Works of EL Lehmann*, pages 209–216. Springer, 2012.

[27] E. L. Lehmann and J. P. Romano. *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer Science and Business Media, 2006.

[28] O. V. Lepski and V. G. Spokoiny. Minimax nonparametric hypothesis testing: the case of an inhomogeneous alternative. *Bernoulli*, 5(2):333–358, 1999.

[29] O. V. Lepski and A. B. Tsybakov. Asymptotically exact nonparametric hypothesis testing in sup-norm and at a fixed point. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 117(1):17–48, 2000.

[30] M. B. McCoy and J. A. Tropp. From Steiner formulas for cones to concentration of intrinsic volumes. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 51(4):926–963, 2014.

[31] N. Meinshausen. Sign-constrained least squares estimation for high-dimensional regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:1607–1631, 2013.

[32] J. Menéndez, C. Rueda, B. Salvador, et al. Dominance of likelihood ratio tests under cone constraints. *The Annals of Statistics*, 20(4):2087–2099, 1992.

[33] J. A. Menéndez and B. Salvador. Anomalies of the likelihood ratio test for testing restricted hypotheses. *Annals of Statistics*, 19(2):889–898, 1991.

[34] J. Menéndnez, C. Rueda, and B. Salvador. Testing non-oblique hypotheses. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 21(2):471–484, 1992.

[35] M. C. Meyer. A test for linear versus convex regression function using shape-restricted regression. *Biometrika*, 90(1):223–232, 2003.

[36] J.-J. Moreau. Décomposition orthogonale d'un espace hilbertien selon deux cônes mutuellement polaires. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris*, 255:238–240, 1962.

[37] M. D. Perlman, L. Wu, et al. The emperor's new tests. *Statistical Science*, 14(4):355–369, 1999.

[38] G. Pisier. *Probabilistic methods in the geometry of Banach spaces*. Springer, 1986.

[39] R. F. Raubertas, C.-I. Charles Lee, and E. V. Nordheim. Hypothesis tests for normal means constrained by linear inequalities. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 15(9):2809–2833, 1986.

[40] T. Robertson. Testing for and against an order restriction on multinomial parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 73(361):197–202, 1978.

[41] T. Robertson. On testing symmetry and unimodality. In *Advances in Order Restricted Statistical Inference*, pages 231–248. Springer, 1986.

[42] T. Robertson and E. J. Wegman. Likelihood ratio tests for order restrictions in exponential families. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 485–505, 1978.

[43] T. Robertson, F. T. Wright, and R. L. Dykstra. *Order Restricted Statistical Inference*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, 1988.

[44] W. Robertson. On measuring the conformity of a parameter set to a trend, with applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 10(4):1234–1245, 1982.

[45] L. L. Scharf. *Statistical signal processing: Detection, estimation and time series analysis*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1991.

[46] B. Sen and M. Meyer. Testing against a linear regression model using ideas from shape-restricted estimation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 2017.

[47] A. Shapiro. Towards a unified theory of inequality constrained testing in multivariate analysis. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*, pages 49–62, 1988.

[48] M. Slawski, M. Hein, et al. Non-negative least squares for high-dimensional linear models: Consistency and sparse recovery without regularization. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:3004–3056, 2013.

[49] V. G. Spokoiny. Adaptive and spatially adaptive testing a nonparametric hypothesis. *Math. Methods Statist*, 7:245–273, 1998.

[50] S. A. Van de Geer. *Applications of empirical process theory*, volume 91. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 2000.

[51] A. W. Van Der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. Weak convergence. In *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*, pages 16–28. Springer, 1996.

[52] G. Warrack and T. Robertson. A likelihood ratio test regarding two nested but oblique order-restricted hypotheses. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79(388):881–886, 1984.

[53] Y. Wei and M. J. Wainwright. Sharp minimax bounds for testing discrete monotone distributions. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2684–2688. IEEE, 2016.

[54] E. H. Zarantonello. Projections on convex sets in Hilbert spaces and spectral theory. In *Contributions to nonlinear functional analysis*, pages 237–424. Academic Press, 1971.